A Confession of Faith

TOUCHING THE

Holy Trinity,

According to the

SCRIPTURE.

Gal. 1, 8, 9.

But if we, or an angel from heaven, (how much more, if Fathers, or Councels?) preach any thing unto you, besides what we have preached unto you, let him be accursed. As we said before, so say I now again, If any one preach any thing unto you, besides what ye have received, let him be accursed.

1 Joh. 2. 24.

Let that therefore abide in you, which ye have heard from the beginning: if that which ye have heard from the beginning abide in you, ye also shall abide in the Son, and in the Father.

LONDON,

Printed in the yeer 1648.

The Preface.

Hough we might justly renew the old complaint, that *Truth is a stranger in the earth*, even in respect of sundry things exceedingly importing the good of humane society, yet shall we finde, upon a diligent examination of the matter, that this wayfaring condition of truth hath in nothing more disclosed it self, then in the knowledge of the true God. For to omit the sudden and general revolt of the Nations to Idolatry, how unstable and fleeting was this knowledge even in *Israel* it self, though God had chosen that Nation above all others to be his people? The History of the Old Covenant everywhere relateth how the *Israelites* went a whoring after Idols, and could by no means be held close to the Lord their God. And it had been well for us, if this ficklenes

of retaining God in knowledg had not ſeiſed Chriſtians alſo, as formerly it did the Jews. But not onely the Hiſtory of by-paſt ages, but even the experience of our owne times abundantly ſheweth, how deeply Chriſtians themſelves are guilty of making a defection from the true God, being ſo thickned on their lees, that (did we not look unto the mighty power of God, who onely doth wondrous works) we ſhould conceive it utterly impoſſible to clarifie them from the filth of their ſuperſtition. For though *Luther* and *Calvin* deſerve much praiſe for the pains they took in cleanſing our Religion from ſundry Idolatrous Pollutions of the Romane Antichriſt, yet are the dregs ſtill left behinde, I mean the Groſs Opinion touching three Perſons in God. Which error not onely made way for thoſe Pollutions, but lying at the bottome corrupteth almoſt our whole Religion. For firſt, it introduceth three Gods, and ſo ſubverteth the Unity of God, ſo frequently inculcated in the Scripture. Neither is it enough for the ſalving of this abſurdity, to ſay with *Athanaſius* that *though the Father be God, the Son God, the holy Spirit God; yet there are not three Gods, but one God*: For who is there (if at leaſt he dare

make uſe of Reaſon in his Religion) who ſeeeth not, that this is as ridiculous, as if one ſhould ſay, *Peter is an Apoſtle, James an Apoſtle, John an Apoſtle, yet there are not three Apoſtles but one Apoſtle*? If the the word *God*, taken for the moſt high God, (as here it is) be predicated of three, it is an Univerſal (ſince not onely *Ariſtotle*, but common underſtanding, ſheweth that to be an Univerſal, which may be predicated of many; that a Singular, which cannot ſo be predicated) and conſequently there are three *Gods*: even as the word *Apoſtle* being an Univerſal, and predicated of three, it unavoidably follows that there are three Apoſtles. Secondly, it hindereth us from praying according to the preſcript of the Goſpel. For how can any man pray to God through his Son Jeſus Chriſt, as the Goſpel directeth us to do, if God be not the Father onely? Did God conſiſt of the three Perſons, would it not, when he invocated God, be all one as if he ſhould ſay, *O Father, Son, and holy Spirit; give me what I ask, through thy Son Ieſus Chriſt*; and ſo Chriſt be the Son not onely of the Father, but alſo of the holy Spirit, yea of himſelf? Again, how can any man ask of God the gift of the holy Spirit, if

if God be not the Father onely, or at most the Father and the Son? would it not, when he invocated God, be all one as if he should say *O Father, Son, and holy Spirit, give me your holy Spirit*, and so the holy Spirit be the Spirit not only of the Father and the Son, but also of himself? wherefore let him that entereth into any of our Churches to partake of the publick worship, but observe, & he shall find that the Ministers in their Prayers do by God mean no other but the Father; for they usually close up their petitions, desiring God to grant what they have begged, for the sake or merits of his Son Jesus Christ, thereby plainly giving us to understand, that by *God* they meant the Father onely. Which very thing, were there nothing else, doth abundantly shew the falsity of their opinion touching three Persons in God. Since after they have most virulently cryed out both in the Pulpit and Press against the opinion of *one God the Father*, they do notwithstanding continually make use of the same in their Prayers, and cannot do otherwise. Thus having one while told men that *once in Christ, and ever in Christ*, they do another while bid them take heed of backsliding, shewing them to that purpose the great danger they are in of being drawn away from Christ. Neither

let

let the Adversaries, to evade this great difficulty, say, that when they pray unto God through his Son, or for his Spirit, by God is meant but one of the three Persons in the Godhead, namely the Father. For first, this is to beg the question; since to say that *God* is put for one of the three Persons in the Godhead, is to take for granted that there are three Persons in the Godhead. The contrary whereof is proved by the Argument which we have alledged. Neither will it be amiss by the way to give notice, that when the controversie is about the supream Deity of the Son and Holy Spirit, the Adversaries commonly answer by begging the question. For instance, if it be argued, that the Son cannot be the most high God, *because he can do nothing of himself, because all authority in heaven and earth hath been given to him, because the Father is greater then he*; it is presently answered, that these things are spoken of Christ according to his humane Nature onely. Whereas this is to take for granted that Christ hath another Nature besides his humane Nature, namely the nature of the most high God; and so to beg the question. Againe, when it is urged that the holy Spirit is not the most high God, *because he*

also

also speaketh not of himself, is sent down from heaven, maketh intercession for the Saints with grones unutterable. The ufual anſwer is, that theſe things are ſpoken after the manner of men, or, as the Learned phraſe it, ἀνθρωποπαθῶς, whereby that is attributed to God, which doth not indeed agree to him, but onely to man. Whereas this alſo is to take for granted that the holy Spirit is God, and ſo to beg the queſtion. But ſecondly, were it true that there are three Perſons in the Godhead, yet could not the word *God* be appropriated to one of them, all appropriation being founded upon ſome excellency and prerogative that one hath above the reſt, who are otherwiſe of the ſame ſort. Which here cannot have place, becauſe the Adverſaries hold that every Perſon of the Trinity is equally God with the others, and that none of them is either before, or greater then another. And indeed, it is impoſſible to conceive how any one ſhould any way have any excellency and prerogative above him that is the moſt high God. Thirdly, were it granted that the word *God* taken for the moſt high God, is appropriated to one of the three Perſons in the Godhead, yet could it at no hand be made uſe of to diſtinguiſh

him

him from the other Persons. For how should a word, equally common unto three, not only be appropriated to one of them, but also be set to distinguish him from the others; since every one can tell that that which is to distinguish and difference one from another, must not be something common unto both, but peculiar to one above the other? Wherefore I desire the Adversaries to confirm this way of distinguishing, which is so rife amongst them, by a like example taken either out of the Scripture, or out of some approved Author. But if they be destitute of examples, let them at least alledge some sufficient reason to evince, that though such distinguishing be not usual, yet it is suitable enough.

In the third place, this Tenet of three Persons in God, prohibiteth us to love and honour him as we ought. For the highest love and honour is due to him who is the most high God. But such love and honour can be exhibited to no more then one Person. For demonstration; the highest love and honour is to be loved and honoured for himself, and all others for him. As the highest good is that which is desired for it self, and all others for it. Suppose now (what I conceive-

ceive will easily be granted; if not, the Scripture it self will extort it, which giveth the title of most High to the Father, and thereby differenceth him both from Christ and the holy Spirit; see *Luke* 1,32,35.) suppose, I say, that the Father is to be loved and honoured with the highest love and honour; then must he be loved and honoured for himself, and all others for him. If all others, then also the Son and holy Spirit. But if the Son and holy Spirit be loved and honoured for another (as indeed the very appellations of the Son and Spirit of God imply that the one was begotten, the other breathed from God, and so are beholding to another for their being, and consequently for the love and honour given to them) then are they not loved and honoured with the highest love and honour, and so are not the most high God, in that whosoever is the most high God, ought to be loved and honoured in this manner, otherwise some other would have a pre-eminence above him who is the most high God; which every one easily perceiveth to be contradictious. And blessed be God, who hath not left us to an uncertainty herein, having plainly told us that Christ is therefore to be honoured as the Father (it doth

doth not say, *as much as the Father*) not because he hath the same Essence, and so is the same God with the Father, but *because the Father hath given him all judgement*, John 5. 22, 23. and also delivers this as a general rule, that *whosoever loveth him that begat, loveth that also which is begotten of him*, 1 John 5. 1. making the love to the Father the ground and reason of the love to the Son; and consequently, the love which we bear to Jesus Christ, to spring from the love we bear to God the Father, who hath given to him both his being and dignity, and whatsoever else is lovely in him, (as indeed there is nothing in him but what is very lovely.) As for the holy Spirit though much love and honour is without question due to him, he being the Person to whom under God and Christ we are most beholding, as receiving from him the greatest benefits, yet are we nowhere in the Scripture expressly enjoyned to love and honour him, (howbeit many, preferring such a Doxologie as was devised by men, before that which is proposed by God himself in his word, commonly ascribe honour and glory to the holy Spirit together with God; which is the less to be wondred at, inasmuch as others stick

not

not to aſcribe honour and glory to the Virgin *Mary* together with God:) and therefore what love and honour we are to exhibit unto Him, is with great wariness to be collected out of the Scripture, which not onely ſaith that *He is of God*, 1 *Cor.* 2. 12. and ſo dependent on God for his being; but alſo *glorifieth Chriſt, in that He receiveth of his, and declareth it to the Apoſtles*, John 16. 14. and ſo is dependent not onely on God, but alſo on Chriſt for his knowledge in the myſtery of the Goſpel, and therefore is inferior to our Lord Chriſt Jeſus. Which is alſo further evident by the benefits which we receive from the holy Spirit. For whereas He diſtributeth to us ſundry ſpiritual gifts, as Tongues, Prophecie, Miraculous Cures, *&c.* 1 *Cor.* 12. 8, 9, 10. Chriſt conferreth upon us remiſſion of ſins, *Act.* 10. 43. *Col.* 3. 13. He is the Earneſt (or rather, Pledge) of our heavenly inheritance, *Eph.* 1. 13, 14. Chriſt the beſtower of the very inheritance it ſelf, *Mat.* 25. 34. *Luke* 22. 29. *John* 17. 2. He aſſureth us that we are the Children of God, *Rom.* 8. 16. Chriſt giveth us the priviledge to become the Children of God, *Joh.* 1. 12. He is given to us upon our repentance, *Act.* 2. 38. Chriſt giveth us the very repentance it ſelf, *Act.* 5. 31. In

In the fourth place, this assertion of three Persons in God, thwarteth the common notion that all men have of God. For our very understanding suggesteth to us, that *God is the same with the first cause of all things, he onely being of himself, and all others from him.* But if any man, to uphold a prejudicate Opinion, will deny the dictate of his reason, he shall be pressed with the Authority of the Scripture in this behalf; for the Apostle, *Rom.* 11.36. saith, that *of him,* (God) *and by him, and for him are all things.* This being so, go they not about to deprive us of our understanding, and that in a thing of the greatest importance, even the knowledge of God himself, who bear us in hand that the other two persons besides the Father are also the most high God, when the very appellations that are given to them, do (as we formerly hinted) clearly intimate that they have their being from the Father, and so are caused by him? But can they be the first cause of all things, who have themselves been caused by another? or are not they caused by another, who are begotten from him?

Fifthly, this Error is the main stumbling-block that keepeth the ancient people of God,

the Jewes, from entring into the Church of Christ, inasmuch as they conceive it to be the genuine doctrine of the Christian religion it self. For they having formerly smarted for their Idolatry, are now grown exceeding cautious of any Tenet looking that way. But this, as we have shewn before, and the Jewes well enough perceive, (who therefore, amongst sundry other things, chiefly object against Christians the common doctrine of the Trinity) maketh *three Gods*. Wherefore though the Jewes have been justly punished by God with long blindness and hardness of heart, for not receiving our Lord Jesus, when he was sent unto them; yet is it observable that this hath not come to pass without the great fault of Christians also, who quickly turning aside from the straight and easie way of believing in God, set down in the Scripture, and (according to the inbred curiosity of men) hunting after obscurities, have by the cunning of Satan lost themselves in the endless mazes of error and superstition; and erecting a new Babel, confounded the pure and plain language of the holy Spirit with their *Trinunities, Coessentialities, Modalities, eternal Generations, eternal Processions, Incarnations, Hypostatical Unions*,

and

and the like monstrous terms, fitter for Conjurers then Christians, especially such as profess to reject the inventions of men, and keep themselves wholly to the word of God.

Sixthly, this Doctrine prohibits the accomplishment of that which God long since promised by the Prophet *Zechariah*, ch. 14. 9. *In that day the LORD shall be one, and his name one* (for so ought the words to be rendred, according to the Hebrew.) And I the rather mention this, because our Nation hath by solemn League and Covenant engaged it self to promote this very thing, making use of the Prophets words in the close of the second Article of the Covenant. Go to now, ye that so much inculcate the Covenant, thundring-out in your Pulpits the judgments of God against the breakers thereof; tell me whether ye of all men are not most guilty of infringing it, and that in the most important Article thereof? do not ye stiffly contend that the LORD is *three* (though there be not so much as one Scripture that saith so) and accordingly call him *Deum Trinum*, and that his name is not *one*, but *three*, even the Father, the Son, and the holy Spirit? And am not I, who on the contrary maintain that the LORD is *one*, not *three*, and to that pur-

poſe alledge moſt expreſs Scriptures, as namely that: *Mark* 12.29. *Hearken, O Iſrael, the* LORD *our God, the Lord is one*, (for ſo ſhould the place be rendred, both becauſe the word *one* is in the Greek ſet after the word *LORD*, and alſo becauſe the Hebrew word Jehovah, for which *LORD* is here put, being a proper name, cannot have the word *one* conſtrued before it;) and that his Name is *one*, even the Father, as innumerable places the of Scripture teſtifie: for how often doth the very Apoſtle *Paul* wiſh grace and peace from *God the Father*? and where doth either he, or any other ſacred writer, uſe ſuch an expreſſion as that of *God the Son*, or *God the holy Spirit*? Am not I, I ſay, the object of your hatred for doing thus, and ſo in effect for keeping the Covenant? & do ye not therefore go about to kill me? Ceaſe therefore any longer to cry, *The Covenant, the Covenant*, unleſs ye keep cloſer to the ſcope thereof, and uſing all diligence enquire after the true God, who he is, and how he muſt be worſhipped? To further which enquiry, or or rather to lead you directly to the knowledge of the thing it ſelf, I have here preſented you with a Confeſſion of Faith touching the holy Trinity, exactly drawn out of the

Scri-

Scriptures, with the texts alledged at large, that ſo you may the better judge how ſuitable the ſame is to the word of God. Neither have I other aim in the publication thereof, then to reſtore that pure and genuine knowledge of God delivered in the Scripture, and which hath for many hundred yeares been hidden from the eyes of men by the corrupt Gloſſes and Traditions of Antichriſt, who hath in ſtead thereof obtruded upon them I know not what abſurd and uncouth Notions, bearing them in hand that Ignorance is the mother of devotion, and that they then think and ſpeak beſt of God, when their conceits and words are moſt irrational and ſenſeleſs. By which means, having renounced thoſe quiddities and ſtrange terms that have vitiated the ſimplicity of the Scripture, and having laid aſleep the contentations ariſing from them, we ſhall at length unanimouſly with one mouth glorifie the God and Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt.

Amen.

John Biddle.

A Confession of Faith touching the Holy Trinity, according to the Scripture.

Article I.

I Believe, That there is one most high God, Creator of heaven and earth, and first cause of all things pertaining to our salvation, and consequently the ultimate object of our Faith and Worship; and that this God is none but the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the first Person of the holy TRINITY.

Joh. 17. 3. *This is eternal life, that they know thee (Father) the only true God, and Jesus christ whom thou hast sent.* Observe here in the first place, that our

Saviour Christ, setting down those persons, in the knowledge of whom eternal life consisteth, makes no mention of the holy Spirit; whereas, if he were God, the knowledge of him would be as necessary for the attainmment of eternal life, as that of the Father. Secondly, he so describeth the Father, as that he makes him the onely true God, thereby manifestly excluding any other person whatsoever from being the true God. Thirdly, as for himself, he doth not say that it is eternal life to know him as eternally begotten, and coessential to the Father, (both which are contradictious in themselves, and unheard-of in the Scripture) but onely as sent by the Father, and consequently such a one as by his will, and in his name manageth the business of our salvation. 1 Cor. 8. 5,6. *Though there be that are called Gods, whether in heaven, or on earth, as there are many Gods, and many Lords; yet to us there is but one God, even the Father, of whom are all things, and we to him; and one Lord, even Jesus Christ, by whom are are all things, and we through him.* In this passage Christ is in express terms excluded from being that one God of Christians, and the holy Spirit in general terms excluded from being that one God; or that one Lord; wherefore if we give such credence to the Apostle as we ought, and had not rather hearken to *Athanasius* then to *Paul*, we will with *Paul* confess, that that one God of Christians is no other then the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, Eph. 4.4,5,6. *There is one Body, and one Spirit, even as ye have been called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, one God and Father of all, who is over all, and among all, and in you all.* Which passage of the same Apostle clearly intimates the different nature, order, and dignity of

the

the three persons of the *HOLY TRINITY*, and was written for that very end: For when he saith, that there is one Spirit, he must mean either one *created*, or one *uncreated* Spirit, since (whatsoever some talk to the contrary,) no other kinde of Spirit is conceivable: Not one *uncreated* Spirit, for so there will be another *uncreated* Spirit besides God, (which is absurd) since this Spirit here is plainly and purposely distinguished from God; wherefore he meaneth one *created* Spirit: But if so, then there is simply one *created* Spirit, or one *created* Spirit by way of excellency onely; not simply one *created* Spirit, for the Scripture elsewhere mentions seven Spirits of God attending on him, *Rev.* 1. 4. which *Beza*, *Drusius* and *Mead* confess to be meant of seven principal Angels; and the Divine Author to the *Hebrews* saith of the Angels in general, *That they are all ministring Spirits*, and consequently *created* Spirits. It remaineth therefore that there is one *created* Spirit by way of excellency onely, which is the holy Spirit. In like manner, when the Apostle saith, that there is one Lord, he must mean either one *made*, or one *unmade* Lord, since by the confession of all, there is no medium; not one *unmade* Lord, for then there will be another *unmade* Lord besides God, (which is absurd) since this Lord also is here plainly and purposely distinguished from God; wherefore he meaneth one *made* Lord: But if so, then there is is either simply one *made* Lord, or else one *made* Lord by way of Excellency onely; not simply one *made* Lord, for so there are many Lords, as not onely the Apostle, but experience it self testifieth. It remaineth therefore that there is one *made* Lord by way of excellency onely, which is Jesus of *Nazareth*, who after he had

been

been crucified by the *Jewes*, was raised up from the dead, and exalted by the right hand of God, and by him made Lord and Christ; as *Peter*, in the beginning of the Gospel, when the holy Spirit was fallen on him, plainly testifies, *Act.* 2.22, 23,33,36. Wherefore since neither the holy Spirit is an *uncreated* Spirit, nor the Lord Jesus an *unmade* Lord, neither of them, but the Father onely is God (I mean, with the Apostle *Paul* himself, God by way of excellency; for otherwise he confesseth that there are many Gods, 1 Cor. 8. 5.) Mat. 24.36. *But of that day, and that hour knoweth none, no not the Angels in heaven, but my Father onely.* If the Father onely sometimes knew the day of Judgement, then neither the Son, (who, take him how you will, is not the Father, and therefore openly confesseth himself to be ignorant of it, *Mark* 13.32.) nor the holy Spirit knew it, and consequently neither of them is the most high God, since he doth, and ever did know all things. Rom. 15.6. *That ye may with one minde and one mouth glorifie God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.* James 3. 9. *Therewith blesse we God, even the Father; and therewith curse we men, who were made after the likeness of God.* John 6. 27. *Labour not for the meat that perisheth, but for that meat which endureth to eternal life, which the Son of man shall give to you: for him hath the Father sealed, the God,* (so the Original hath it.) In these three passages, God (that is, by the confession of all, the most high God) is by the Scripture it self interpreted the Father, and therefore none but he can be God. *John* 8.54. Jesus answered, *If I honour my self, my honour is nothing; it is my Father that honoureth me, whom ye say that he is your God,*

You

You ſee here who was the God that the Jewes worſhipt, namely the Father; and herein there is no difference between them and Chriſtians, ſince the Apoſtle *Paul* teſtifieth, 2 Tim. 1. 3. *That he ſerved God from his fore-fathers*; that is, the ſame God which he had received from the Jewes his forefathers. See alſo *Act.* 3. 13. and *Chap.* 5. 30, 31. and *Chap.* 22. 14. In which three places the Father is called *the God of Abraham, the God of Iſaac, and the God of Jacob*; and by that appellation diſtinguiſhed from the Son; which could not be, if the Son were the ſame God with the Father, ſince common things do not diſtinguiſh, but ſuch as are proper: But if the Son be not the ſame God with the Father, much leſs the holy Spirit, ſince the Scripture abundantly witneſſeth that he is ſent and diſpoſed of by the Son. Neh. 9. 6. *Thou, even thou art LORD alone; thou haſt made Heaven, the Heaven of Heavens, with all their Hoſt, the earth, and all things therein.* Obſerve here that the *Levites* do not ſay, *Ye, even ye are Lord*, but *Thou, even thou art Lord alone*; intimating that one perſon onely is the moſt high God, for the word [*thou*] denoteth a ſingle perſon: And this is the perpetual doctrine of the whole Scripture. But if one perſon onely be the moſt high God, this perſon muſt of neceſſity be the Father, ſince he, by the confeſſion of all ſides, is the moſt high God. Neither doth that paſſage, *Gen.* 1. 26. wherein God ſaith, *Let us make man*, any whit contradict this truth. For doth it follow from thence that there are ſeveral Perſons in God? Might I not by the ſame kinde of arguing conclude, that becauſe Chriſt, Mark 4. 30. ſaith, *Whereunto ſhall we liken the Kingdom of God, and with what compariſon ſhall we compare it?*

and

and John 3. 11. *Verily, verily I ſay unto thee, we ſpeak what we know, and teſtifie what we have ſeen, and ye receive not our teſtimony*: therefore there are ſeveral Perſons in Chriſt? And alſo, becauſe *Paul*, 2 Cor. 10. 1, 2. ſaith, *Now I Paul my ſelf beſeech you, by the meekneſs and gentleneſs of Chriſt, who in preſence am baſe among you, but being abſent am bold toward you: I ſay, I beſeech you, that I may not be bold when I am preſent, with that confidence wherewith I think to be bold againſt ſome, who think of us, as if we walked according to the fleſh*: therefore there are ſeveral Perſons in *Paul*? The utmoſt that can be concluded from this paſſage of *Geneſis*, is, that there was ſome other perſon with God, whom he employed in the Creation, as of other things, ſo of man. Which Perſon had been before mentioned by *Moſes*, verſe 2. where he ſaith, *The Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters*. Thus it is ſaid of the Lord, Pſal. 104. 30. *Thou ſendeſt forth thy Spirit, they are created: and thou renewest the face of the earth*: and Job 26. 13. *By his Spirit he hath garniſhed the heavens; his hand hath formed the crooked Serpent*. Obſerve by the way, that theſe Scriptures plainly intimate that the Spirit was but the inſtrument of God in creating things, ſince God is ſaid to have garniſhed the heavens *by him*, and *that he was ſent by God* to that purpoſe, and ſo miniſtred unto him. Moreover, the wiſe *Elihu* ſaith, Job 33. 4. *The Spirit of God hath made me, and the breath of the Almighty hath given me life*. Which plainly ſheweth that the Spirit had a hand in creating man. It was the Spirit therefore, and he onely, to whom God ſaid, *Let us make man*. For had the Son of God, Chriſt Jeſus, been alſo imployed in creating *Adam*, would

not he likewiſe have been mentioned in the hiſtory of the Creation? was it not as material, and altogether of as great conſequence for *Moſes* and the *Jewes* to have known, that the Son of God, Chriſt Jeſus, was employed by God in creating *Adam*, as the holy Spirit? But it is well that the holy Scripture, whileſt it attributeth creation unto Chriſt, doth, what by the nature of the thing it ſelf, what by the circumſtances of the places, what by expreſs words, ſignifie that it is meant not of the firſt and old creation, but of the ſecond and new, conſiſting in the reduction of things to a new ſtate, condition, or order. Otherwiſe, had he at firſt created *Adam*, how could he himſelf ſay, Mat. 19. 4. *And he (Jeſus) anſwered and ſaid unto them, Have ye not read, that he which made them (Adam and Eve) at the beginning, made them Male and Female?* Is not that deſcription, *He that made them*, &c. made uſe of to diſtinguiſh God from Chriſt? And doth not Chriſt here take it for granted, together with the Phariſees, that not himſelf, but another created man? Again, how could *Peter* ſay, 1 Epiſt. 1. 20. Who (Chriſt) *verily was foreordained*, (*Gr. foreknown*) *before the foundation of the world*: had Chriſt then had a being? Are not thoſe things onely foreknown, that are to come, and not already in being? Thirdly, how could *Paul*, Rom. 5. 14. ſay, *After the ſimilitude of Adam's tranſgreſſion, who is the figure* (or, *type*) *of him that was to come*, (or, *that was to be*, as the Gr. expreſſion ὁ μέλλοντος doth ſignifie:) had Chriſt then not onely had a being, but created *Adam*? was *Adam* a type of him that created him? was he that created *Adam*, as yet to be? can it be ſaid of any one, *that he is to be*, whoſe perſon doth already exiſt?

This

This which we have ſpoken of the holy Spirit, that he was preſent at the Creation of the world, and is included when God ſaid, *Let US make man*, doth clear thoſe other paſſages of the Scripture, where the like expreſſion is uſed; as *Gen.* 3. 22. *And the Lord God ſaid, Behold, the man is become as one of Us, to know good and evil.* Gen. 11. 6, 7. *And the Lord ſaid, Behold, the people is one, and they have all one language: and this they begin to do, and now nothing will be reſtrained from them, which they have imagined to do. Go to, let Us go down, and there confound their language, that they may not underſtand one anothers ſpeech.* Iſai. 6. 8. *Alſo I heard the voice of the Lord, ſaying, Whom ſhall I ſend, and who will go for Us?* For it ought ſutably to be underſtood, that by *Us* in all theſe places, is meant the Lord with his Spirit; ſeeing the Spirit is elſewhere called *the Spirit of knowledge*, Iſa. 11. 2. and ſaid to give *diverſitie of Tongues*, 1 Cor. 12. 10. 11. Act. 2. 4. and *Iſaiah* himſelf teſtifieth, *that both the Lord and his Spirit had ſent him*, Chap. 48. 16. It is alſo eaſie to conceive that by wiſdome, *Prov.* 8. is meant the Spirit of wiſdome; for ſo is the holy Spirit denominated by *Iſaiah*, chap. 11. 2. and whoſoever ſhall exactly conſider what is ſpoken of the holy Spirit in this paſſage of *Iſaiah*, and in the hiſtory of the Creation, and elſewhere in the Scripture, and compare it with what is ſpoken of wiſdome, *Prov.* 8. eſpecially if he further add what is more amply declared in the 7. 8. and 9. chap. of the wiſdome of *Solomon*, and in the 1. and 24. chap. of *Siracides*, will perceive that as by wiſdom is meant a moſt excellent creature, ſo that creature is the holy Spirit.

Finally, this intimateth to us, why the ſaid *Elihu*,

hu, Job 35. 10. ſpeaketh on this wiſe, *But none ſaith, Where is God my Maker,* (Heb. *Makers*) *who giveth ſongs in the night?* The word *Makers* implyeth that more then one perſon made man, though in a different order of cauſality. But inaſmuch as God is ſaid to be the *Makers*, this intimateth that whatſoever power of making was in any other perſon employed in that work, it proceeded from God; ſo that upon the matter God was the Makers.

Article II.

I believe, That there is one chief Son of the moſt High God, or ſpiritual, heavenly, and perpetual Lord and King, ſet over the Church by God, and ſecond cauſe of all things pertaining to our ſalvation, and conſequently, the intermediate object of our Faith and Worſhip: and that this Son of the moſt High God is none but Jeſus Chriſt, the ſecond Perſon of the HOLY TRINITY.

Luke 1. 32. *He* (Jeſus) *ſhall be great, and ſhall be called the Son of the moſt High.* Where note, that the Son is not equal to the Father, as the very Son himſelf openly profeſſeth, *Joh.* 14. 28. where making a compariſon, not between any nature of his

his that was not a person, but between his own very person, and that of the Father, he saith expressly, *My Father is greater then I.* Note, I say, that the Son is not equal to the Father; otherwise the Epithete of *Most High* could not be appropriated to the Father, and put to distinguish him from the Son, (as neither could it afterwards, vers. 35. be made use of to distinguish Him from the holy Spirit, if the holy Spirit were equal to the Father) for how can an expression alike common to twain, be apt to distinguish one from the other? How is the Father, and that contradistinctly to the Son, *the Most High*, if the Son be *as High* as He? Though some from that mistaken text, *Phil.* 2. 5, 6, 7, 8. would infer the contrary, and so contradict the express words of Christ himself. Whereas, if the place be rightly considered, it maketh against them; the words and sense being thus: *Let this minde be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus; who being in the form of God*, (for the exercise and demonstration of divine Power, whereby he wrought Miracles in as free and uncontrolled a manner, as if God himself had been on the earth) *thought it not robbery* (or, *a prey*) *to be equal with God:* (that is, did not esteem this equality of his with God, consisting in the free exercise of Divine Power, to be a prey, by holding it fast, and refusing to let it go, as Robbers are wont to do when they have got a prey, or booty:) *but* (Gr.) *emptied himself*, (in making no use of the Divine Power within him, to rescue himself out of the hands of the Officers sent to apprehend him) *and took upon him the form of a servant*, (in suffering himself to be apprehended, bound, and whipt, as servants are wont to be) *being made in the likeness of men*, (that

is,

is, ordinary and vulgar men, who are endued with no divine power.) *And being found in fashion,* (or, *habit*) *as a man,* (that is, in his outward quality, condition, and acting no whit differing from a common man,) *he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the Cross.* Now that this place doth not speak of an *Incarnation,* or *Assumption of humane nature,* (as they term it) nor of such an *Equality* as is commonly conceived, is evident from all the circumstances. For first, the scope of the Apostle is to exhort the *Philippians* to humility, and that they would do nothing out of vain-glory. To which purpose, he setteth before them the example of Christ Jesus. And therefore the act of Christ which he doth exemplifie, must be manifest. Since examples are wont to be taken onely from such things as are manifest. But to whom was or could that Incarnation, which Christians commonly talk of, be manifest, when they themselves say it passeth the understanding of Angels to comprehend it? yea that there was any Incarnation at all made, the Scripture nowhere expressly affirmeth, nor can it be so much as proved by any good consequence from thence, as several learned men have shewn. Secondly, the Apostle speaketh of our Lord as a Man, in that he giveth him the titles of *Christ Jesus,* both which agree to him onely as a man. For he is called Jesus, as he was a child conceived of the holy Spirit in the Virgins womb, and brought forth by her, *Luke* 1.27,30,31,35. and Christ signifieth the anointed, *John* 1.41. and accordingly Jesus is expressly called the Christ of God, *Luke* 9.20. but he was anointed (as the Adversaries themselves will confess) as a man, and not as God.

See *Act.* 10. 38. Thirdly, he doth not say, *that the Son thought it not robbery to be equal with the Father*, which words would indeed have plainly thwarted those formerly cited out of the 14 of *John*: but *that Christ Jesus thought it not robbery*, or *a prey, to be equall with God*. Which cannot be in respect of Essence; for he must either have the same Essence in number, or a different one. Not the same Essence in number, for then he will not be equal with God in Essence, but the same: for equality must be in respect of two things different at least in number, otherwise it will not be Equality, but Identity. Thus he that is equal to another in stature, must not have the same stature in number with the other, but different in number, though the same in kinde. But the Adversaries hold that the Father and the Son have the same Essence in number, not in species or kinde. If Christ hath an Essence different in number from that of God, it must needs also be inferior thereunto, there being no Essence equal to his, as every one will confess. Wherefore the Equality aforesaid cannot be in respect of Essence, but of something else. But let it consist in whatsoever you will, it must either be simple & absolute, or else only in part (since *Aristotle*, according to the common notion of men, acknowledgeth in his *Categories*, that Equality admitteth more and less.) Not simple and absolute, for then God would not be *the most High*, since he is not *the most High*, who hath another simply and absolutely equal with him. Besides, that description would be superfluous, which the Apostle useth, saying, *who being in the form of God*; for if this description be, (as indeed it ought to be, and is) pertinent to the thing in hand, it intimateth

that

that this Equality of Christ with God is to be extended no farther, then as he was in the form of God. But the form of a thing, (as appeareth from the common acceptation of the word, and from that following clause, *He took upon him the form of a servant*; and also from those words, *Mark* 16. 12. *After that he appeared in another form unto two of them, as they walked, and went into the Country*,) is something visible and outwardly apparent, such as is neither the Essence, nor power of any thing, but onely the exercise and demonstration of power. In the exercise therefore and demonstration of divine power, whereby he did miracles, was Christ in the form of God, and equal to God, as the Apostle *John* explaineth it, chap. 5. 18. saying, *Therefore the Jewes sought the more to kill him, because he not onely had broken the Sabbath, but said also, that God was his Father, making himself equal with God.* Which is not so to be understood, as if Christ by calling God his Father, made himself equal with God, (for who seeth not the manifest absurdity hereof, since the very appellation of Father implyeth a prerogative above the Son (as Christ himself acknowledgeth in the forequoted 14 of *John*) in that the Son, as he is the Son, is beholding to the Father for his being? Again, the words would then have run thus, *thereby making himself equal with God*, not simply, *making himself equal with God*:) but because by uttering those words, verse 17. *My Father worketh hitherto, and I work*, he did both say that God was his Father, and in working made himself equal with God. Furthermore, had Christ been simply and absolutely equal with God, how could he be exceedingly exalted by God, since by this reckoning he would become higher then God himself? which is not

onely absurd, but blasphemous to imagine. In the fourth place, had the Apostle here spoken of an assumption of the humane nature, he would not have said, *that Christ became in the likeness of men, and was found in fashion as a man:* for if men (as the Adversaries must hold, when they alledge this place to prove that Christ assumed a humane nature, and became man) be here considered according to their Essence and nature, this would imply that Christ had not the Essence, and Nature, but onely the likeness and fashion of a man, and so was not a true and real man. By men therefore are here meant vulgar and ordinary men, for so this word is elsewhere taken in the Scriptures, as *Psal.* 82. 6. *I have said ye are Gods: and all of you are children of the most High. But ye shall dye like men, and fall like one of the Princes:* and Judg. 16. 7. *then shall I be weak, and be as one of men* (so the Hebrew, *ekadh haadam*, signifieth.) See also vers. 11. of the same Chap. Fifthly, when it is said, *But emptyed himself,* (or, as our English Translation hath it, *Made himself of no reputation*) this implyeth, that if Christ had not emptyed himself of that divine Form, he had thought it a prey to be equal with God. Which cannot without the implication of a contradiction, or, what is worse, of blasphemy, be affirmed of God. But Christ had thought it robbery, or a prey, to have been equal with God in doing miracles, if he had not laid aside the exercise and demonstration of his divine power, and fallen into the hands of his Adversaries, as a weak and vulgar man. For unless he had done so, he had disobeyed the commandment of God, and consequently thought his divine form to be a prey, not a gift of God;

and

and that it was to be kept on for his owne glory, not put off for the glory of God. It is therefore evident by what hath been said, that this place hindereth not, but that we ought to believe that Christ Jesus is simply inferiour to God, and so not God. And indeed, I can never sufficiently wonder at the stupidity of men, who because the Apostle saith, *That Christ Jesus thought it not robbery to be equal with God*, conclude that therefore he is God. For is it possible for any one to be equal with himself? Must not he that is equal with any one, be supposed not to be he with whom he is equal? But let us now proceed to other Scriptures. 1 *Cor.* 8.6. *To us there is but one Lord, even Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we through him.* By all things are not here meant all things simply, but all things pertaining to our salvation, as is evident both in that he speaketh of Christians, and also putteth an article before the word [*all*] in the Gr. which implyeth a restriction. Acts 2.39. *Let all the House of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made this same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, Lord and Christ.* Phil.2.9,10. *He* (Jesus) *humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the Cross: Wherefore God hath also highly exalted him, and given him a name that is above every name, that in the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in Heaven, and things on earth, and things under the earth, & that every tongue should confess that Jesus is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.* 1 Pet.1.21. *Who through him* (Jesus) *believe in God that raised him from the dead, & gave him glory, so that your Faith and hope is in God.* Joh.12.44. *He that believeth in me* (Jesus) *believeth not in me, but in him that sent me,* Rom.1.8. *I thank my God, through Jesus Christ, that your faith is spoken of through the*

whole world. Rom. 16. 27. *To the onely wise God, through Jesus Christ, be glory for ever.* These five places last quoted, shew, that the glory & thanks that we give to Christ, and the faith and hope that we place in him, do not rest in him, but through him tend to God the Father, and consequently, that the Son is not equal to the Father, but subordinate to him. 1 *Cor.* 15. 24, 25, 28. *Then cometh the end, when he* (Christ) *shall have delivered up the Kingdome to God even the Father* (Gr. *to the God and Father*) *when he shall have put down all rule, and all authority, and power,* (or *force.*) *For he must reign till he hath put all the enemies under his Feet. And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all.* It is here said, that Christ shall reign till he hath put all the enemies under his feet; which done, he shall deliver up the Kingdome to God the Father, and become subject unto him. But how could these things come to pass, if Christ were the *most High God?* Certainly by so doing, Christ would cease to be the *most High God*; for without controversie, he to whom any one becometh subject, is higher then he that becometh subject. Neither let the Adversaries say, that this is spoken of Christ according to his humane nature onely. For (to omit that this goodly distinction is nowhere to be found in Gods word) First, this is to take for granted that Christ hath more then one nature, and so to beg the question, whereas it is a signe of a desperate cause, not to be able to answer objections without taking for granted what is in controversie. Secondly, the Apostle here speaketh of Christ as a person, in that he speaketh of him as reigning, since none can be a King and reign, but a Person,

ſon, and that as a perſon, all Offices being proper to perſons: wherefore they muſt grant, either that the Perſon of Chriſt, which they hold to be a perſon of ſupream Deity, delivereth up his Kingdome, and becometh ſubject; or that his humane nature (as they phraſe it) is a perſon, and conſequently, leſt there ſhould be two Perſons in one and the ſame ſubject, and ſo Chriſt not be one but two, that he hath no other nature and Perſon. The latter of which ſubverteth the opinion of the Adverſaries; the firſt, alſo it ſelf. Thirdly, it is worth the obſerving that the Apoſtle ſaith, *Then ſhall alſo the Son himſelf be ſubject.* But how can the Son himſelf become ſubject, if onely a humane nature added to the Son, and not the very perſon of the Son is ſubjected? Certainly this place (which is ſo full and clear, that ſundry being convinced by the evidence thereof, have abandoned the common groſs opinion of two natures in Chriſt,) ſeemeth purpoſely fitted by God to ſtop their mouths, who ſhould go about to elude what is here ſpoken to ſhew the ſubordination and inferiority of Chriſt to the Father, by ſaying that the Son ſhall be ſubject according to the humane nature onely: for the Apoſtle moſt emphatically ſaith, *That the Son alſo himſelf ſhall be ſubject*; ſo that if there be any nature in him better then other, according to which he chiefly is the Son of God, even according to that ſhall he become ſubject. *Rom.* 10. 9. *If thou ſhalt confeſs with thy mouth, that Jeſus is Lord,* (ſo the Original hath it, as will further appear by comparing this place with *Phil.* 2. 10.) *and ſhalt believe with thy heart, that God hath raiſed him from the dead, thou ſhalt be ſaved.* The Apoſtle here ſets down a brief

Symbole of the Christian Religion, declaring what is to be both believed with the heart, and confessed with the mouth, concerning the dignity of Christ; and which if we believe and confess, we shall obtain salvation. But how could it be, that if Christ were the most High God, the same with the Father, and had raised himself from the dead, and that by his own power, the Apostle should here affirm, *That if we onely confess with the mouth, that Jesus is Lord, and believe with the heart*, (not that he raised himself, but) *that God raised him from the dead, we shall be saved?* Certain I am, that *Athanasius* in his Creed is far more peremptory; for he saith, That unless a man beleeve that Christ is of one and the same Essence, and consequently one and the same God with the Father, he cannot be saved; whereas the Apostle, speaking of that Faith which is necessary to salvation, intimateth it to be sufficient if we believe that Jesus is Lord. Now whether *Paul* or *Athanasius* be rather to be credited, I leave it to all Christians to judge. The like may be said of that passage, *Rom.* 4. 22, 23, 24. and that *John* 17. 3. which we also alledged on the former Article; *Eph.* 4. 4, 5, 6. *There is one Body, and one Spirit, even as ye have been called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one Faith, &c.*

Article III.

I believe, That Jesus Christ, to the intent he might be our Brother, and have a fellow-feeling of our infirmities, and

and ſo become the more ready to help us, (the conſideration whereof, is the greateſt encouragement to piety that can be imagined) hath no other then a humane nature, and therefore in this very nature, is not onely a Perſon, (ſince none but a humane perſon can be our Brother) but alſo our Lord, yea our God.

2 Tim. 2. 5. *There is one God, and one Mediator of God and Men, the Man Chriſt Jeſus,* John 3. 13. *And no man hath aſcended up to heaven, but he that deſcended from heaven, the Son of man, which is in heaven,* or rather, *which was in heaven,* as the Participle ὢν in the Greek not onely may (in that it is of the Preterimperfect as well as of the Preſent tenſe) but muſt here be rendred; otherwiſe theſe words will contradict thoſe immediately going before: for how could Chriſt ſtill be in heaven, after he had deſcended from thence? Againe, he would as a man (for he here ſtileth himſelf the Son of Man) be in heaven and on the earth at the ſame time, which is confeſſed to be falſe) *John 6. 62. what if ye ſhall ſee the Son of man aſcend up where he was before* (or, *had been before?*) John 8. 40. *But now ye ſeek to kill me, a man who have told you the truth, which I have heard from God.* Joh. 3. 14, 15. *And as Moſes lifted up the Serpent in the wilderneſs, even ſo muſt the Son of Man be lifted up: That whoſoever believeth on him, may not periſh, but have eternal life.* Mat. 9. 6, 7, 8. *But that ye may know*

that

that the Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins, (then he speaketh to the sick of the palsie) Arise, take up thy bed, and go unto thine house. And he arose, and departed to his house. But when the multitudes saw it, they marvelled, and glorified God, which had given such power to men. John 5.22,23. *The Father judgeth none, but hath given all judgement to the Son: that all should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father:* and verse 7. *And (the Father) hath given him (the Son) authority to execute judgement also, because he is the Son of Man.* Mark 2. 28. *Therefore the Son of Man is Lord also of the Sabbath.* 1 Cor. 15.21,22. *For since by man came death, by man came also the Resurrection of the dead: For as in Adam (or, by Adam) all dye, even so in Christ (or, by Christ) shall all be made alive:* and vers. 45. 47. *The first man Adam was made a living soul, the last Adam a quickning Spirit. The first man is from the earth earthly (or, dusty:) the second man is the Lord from heaven.* Mat. 24.30,31. *And they shall see the Son of man come in the clouds of heaven, with power and great glory. And he shall send his Angels with a trumpet of great sound, and they shall gather together his Elect from the four windes, from one end of heaven to the other.* Mat. 16.27,28. *The Son of Man shall come in the glory of his Father, with his Angels; and then shall he reward every man according to his doing. Verily I say unto you, There be some standing here, who shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of man come in his Kingdome.* Dan. 7.13.14. *I saw in the night visions, and behold one like the Son of Man came with the clouds of Heaven, and came to the Ancient of daies, and they brought him near before him (Heb. they offered him before him.) And there was given him dominion and glory, and a kingdome,*

that

that all People, Nations and Languages, ſhould ſerve him: his dominion is an everlaſting dominion, which ſhall not paſs away, and his kingdom that which ſhall not be deſtroyed. Obſerve now in the firſt place, that the moſt excellent things that are in the Scripture attributed to Chriſt, are attributed to him not only under the notion, but alſo under the very name of a man; *as to be a Mediator; to have aſcended and been in heaven before his death and Reſurrection; to have heard the truth from God; to be believed on unto eternal life; to forgive ſins; to have all judgement, and therefore to be honoured as the Father; to be Lord of the Sabbath; to be the Author of the Reſurrection; to be a quickning Spirit; to be the Lord from Heaven; to ſend his Angels, and gather his Elect; to come in his Kingdome, and render a reward to every man according to his doing; to have an everlaſting dominion given to him, that all Nations may ſerve him.* Why then ſhould we imagine another nature in him, beſides his humane, to ſuſtain his great dignity? Obſerve alſo, that the Scripture in the aforeſaid Quotations, whilſt it calleth Chriſt a man, ſpeaketh of him as a Perſon, in that it ſpeaketh of him as a Mediator, Embaſſador, Saviour, Lord, Judge, or King, all which are the names of Perſons; all actions and offices belonging to Perſons onely, as ſuch. Wherefore Chriſt according to his humane nature is a Perſon and conſequently (unleſs we will abſurdly hold with *Neſtorius*, that he hath two Perſons) cannot be a Perſon in the divine nature. *Deut.* 18. 15. *The Lord thy God will raiſe up unto thee a Prophet from the midſt of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me; unto him ye ſhall hearken.* You ſee here that Chriſt (for this is a Prophecie concerning him, as *Peter* teſtifieth

seeth, *Acts* 3.22.) was to be a Prophet whom the Lord God of the *Israelites* should raise up unto them of their brethren, like unto *Moses*, and therefore did not already exist in the time of *Moses*, much less was the Lord God, unless any one will be so absurd as to say, that the Lord God can raise up himself for a Prophet. *Act.* 2. 22, 23, 36. *Jesus of Nazareth, a Man approved of God amongst you, by miracles, signes, and wonders, which God did by him in the midst of of you, as ye your selves know: Him being delivered up by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken, and by wicked hands crucified and slain, whom God hath raised up from the dead, having loosed the bands* (or rather, *throes*) *of death, in that it was impossible he should be held by it. Wherefore being exalted by the right hand of God, and having received the promise of the Holy Spirit from the Father, He hath poured out this which ye now see and hear: Therefore let all the House of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made this very Jesus, whom ye have crucified, Lord and Christ.* These words of the Apostle *Peter* (as well as those of *Paul*, *Eph.*4. which were formerly discussed) give clear and full evidence, touching the several nature, order and dignity of the three Persons of the *HOLY TRINITY*. For first, in that *Peter* here calleth Jesus a *Man*, and saith, *that God wrought miracles by him*, this sheweth that he was not God himself, nor wrought miracles by his owne proper power, which naturally resided in him; but was onely the instrument of God in working them. Againe, when he saith, *that Jesus being exalted by the right hand of God, and having received the promise of the Holy Spirit from the Father, poured him out upon his Disciples*; this argueth

gueth, that he gave the holy Spirit as a man, for he could neither be *exalted by God*, nor *receive the promise of the Holy Spirit from the Father*, but as a man, (for according to the supposition of the Adversaries themselves, the holy Spirit proceedeth from Christ as he is God, as well as from the Father) and consequently the holy Spirit himself is so far from being God, (inasmuch as it is a Lord, yea impossible that God should be received in promise from any one) as that he is not equal to Christ as man, since his exaltation, because he that is given and disposed of by another, must be inferiour in dignity to him that giveth him. Finally, whereas he saith that God hath made this very Jesus, whom the Jewes had crucified, Lord and Christ; this intimateth, that Jesus, as a man, (for neither could any other but a man be crucified) was made Lord by God, and therefore that his humane nature is a Person, (since nothing but a Person can be made a Lord) so that we need not feign to our selves any other nature in Christ, besides his humane nature, to sustain this Lordship of his; wherefore by this passage it plainly appeareth, That the *TRINITY* which the Apostle *Peter* believed, consisteth of God the Father, of the Man Jesus Christ our Lord, and of the holy Spirit, the Gift of God through our Lord Jesus Christ. Now shall the Apostle *Peter*, having before affirmed *that Jesus was a man approved of God by miracles, which God did by him*, afterwards say, *Let all the House of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made him Lord and Christ, this Jesus whom ye have crucified*, And shall I nevertheless be induced by I know not what forced consequences of Men, repugnant to reason, and the stream of the Scriptures,

ptures, in despight of so signal an admonition proceeding from the infallible inspiration of the holy Spirit, to believe that Christ, as to his nature, is not onely a man; but that very God which did those miracles by him, and made him Lord and Christ. Far be it. *Isa.9.6. Unto us a Child is born, unto us a Son is given, and the Government shall be upon his shoulder, and his name shall be called Wonderful*, (by reason of his Exaltation, which is so strange and wonderful, that even the greatest part of Christians cannot believe it, and therefore imagine another nature in Christ, besides his humane nature, as thinking a man uncapable of so transcendent an Exaltation,) *Counsellor*, (in acquainting us with all the Counsel of God,) *a mighty God* (by reason of the Divine Empire over all things, both in Heaven and on earth, conferred on him by the Father; agreeable whereunto, *Paul* called him *a God over all, blessed for evermore*, Rom.9.5.) *a Father of the age*, (in being the Author of the age to come, as both the Septuagint, and the old Latine Interpreter expound it; or else a Father of Eternity, in being the Author of Eternal Life to all that obey him. For to render the words as the English Translators do, who here call Christ the everlasting Father, is to confound the Person of the Son with that of the Father, and so to introduce *Sabellianism*,) *the Prince of Peace*. When the Prophet here saith, *That the Child which was to be born to us, and the Son that was to be given to us, shall be called a mighty God*, He sufficiently intimateth, that Christ in his humane nature should be a mighty God, so that we need not fancy any other nature in him.

John

John 20.27,28. *Then saith he* (Jesus) *to Thomas, Reach hither thy finger, and behold my hands; and reach hither thy hand, and thrust it into my side, and be not faithless, but believing. And Thomas said unto him, My Lord, and my God.* Observe how *Thomas* here calleth that man Jesus, whom he saw and felt, his Lord, and his God; but directeth not his speech to I know not what second Person or Subsistence of God, which he neither saw nor felt, nor indeed ever was in *rerum natura*. Joh. 10.33,34,35,36. *The Jewes answered him, saying, For a good work we stone thee not, but for blasphemy, and because that thou, being a man, makest thy self a God* (so it is in the Gr.) *Jesus answered them, Is it not written in your Law, I said, Ye are Gods? If he called them Gods unto whom the word of God came, and the Scripture cannot be broken: Say ye of him, whom the Father hath sanctified, and sent into the world, Thou blasphemest, because I said, I am the Son of God?* Had Christ been endued with a divine nature, besides his humane, and did his Godhead consist therein (as the Adversaries affirm) it would have been necessary, for answering the *Jewes*, here to have declared it. They objected unto Christ the crime of blasphemy, *for that he being a man, made himself a God*; doth he therefore, to decline the imputation of blasphemy, resort to an eternal Generation, or Hypostatical union of natures, saying, *If he call them Gods, to whom the word of God came, say ye of him, whom the Father eternally begot out of his substance, so that he is very God of very God, coessential, coeternal, coequal with the Father, and in whom the humane nature is Hypostatically united to the divine, Thou blasphemest, because I said, I am the Son of God?* Nothing less. But on the contrary,

he

he sheweth that he is therefore the Son of God, and consequently a God, because the Father had sanctified him and sent him into the world, and so not for having the divine Nature united to the Humane, but for the sanctification of the Father: Mat. 1. 20. *Joseph thou Son of David, fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife: for that which is conceived in her, is of the Holy Spirit.* Had Christ had a Divine Nature in being the Eternall Son of God, the Angel would not have told *Joseph*, that what was conceived in the womb of his Wife, was of the Holy Spirit, otherwise not only the Humane Nature of the Eternall Son of God, but the very Eternall Son himself; (for the Adversaries hold that he was conceived and born of the Virgin *Mary*,) would be of the Holy Spirit, and so Christ not onely as Man, but also as the Eternall Son of God, be caused by the Holy Spirit. The latter of which (though flowing from their opinion touching the Nature and Conception of Christ,) is yet denied by the Adversaries; and so should the former too, since he that was the Eternall Son of God, coessentiall with the Father, if he would be incarnated, needed not the assistance of the Holy Spirit to furnish him with a Humane Nature from a Virgin, being himself able to produce it of her, unless you will say that his own Divine Nature was in the mean time idle. This consideration is so forcible, that *Justin Martyr*, pressed with the difficulty thereof, saith in his Apology to the Roman Emperour, that by the Holy Spirit which came upon the Virgin, and caused her conception, is at no hand to be understood any other then the *word* or *Son of God*; contrary to the perpetuall usage of the Scripture, which by the Holy Spirit alwies

always meaneth, not the Second but the Third Person of the HOLY TRINITY. Moreover, were the opinion of the Adversaries true, that the Son of God came down and took a Humane Nature of the Virgin, the Angel *Gabriel*, when the Virgin demanded of him, how she should conceive, would not have answered, Luke 1. 35. *The Holy Spirit shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that Holy thing which shall be born of thee, shall be called the Son of God:* But, *the Son of God shall come upon thee, and the Eternall Word shall overshadow thee: therefore also that Holy thing which shall be born of thee, being assumed into the unity of the Person of the Eternall Word, shall be called the Son of God.* Act. 10. 38. *God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Spirit, and with power, who went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the Devel: for God was with him.* Luke 22. 48. *And there appeared an Angel to him (Christ) from Heaven, strengthening him.* Mat. 27. 46. *Jesus cried with a loud voice, saying, My God, My God, why hast thou forsaken me?*

What need was there that the holy Spirit should be given unto Christ, to enable him to do miracles; and an Angel appear from heaven unto him to strengthen him; or why should he so earnestly expostulate with God for forsaking him, if Christ were he, by whom the First Creation was performed, had a Divine Nature, and was God himself? Could not he that first created the World, do miracles without being impowered by another? would it be said of him that had the Divine Nature, that he

Justin Martyr is exceedingly puzzelled with this objection, in his conference with Trypho.

did miracles, *because God was with him*, and not rather, *because he was God?* or needed he in his agony to be strengthened by an Angel? would not the Divine Nature in Christ, at this rate, be in the mean time idle and useless? could he that was very God himself, cry out, *My God, My God, why hast thou forsaken me?* was he his own God, and had forsaken himself? These things have I here set down, out of Zeal to the true Son of God, the Man Christ Jesus, that the Adversaries may by this means be brought to bethink themselves, and not substitute a false one in his stead, namely an Eternall Son begotten out of the substance of God, whereas there is no place in the Scripture that either saith, or intimateth any such thing. But they will say, that if Christ were not God, he could not satisfy for our sins: which reason overthroweth it self, and sheweth their opinion concerning the Divine Nature of Christ to be fictitious. For how can God satisfy God? can any one make satisfaction to himself? Neither will it relieve them, to reply, that there are severall Persons in God, and so the Second satisfied the First. For if there be Three Persons to whom we are indebted, and but one of them satisfied, we are in as bad a condition as before, in that we stand in need of some one to make satisfaction to the Second and Third Persons in God. If they further answer, that the Second freely forgiveth us; This will make Him more bountiful then the First, who would not do it without receivng full satisfaction. But this Doctrine of the satisfaction of Christ, as well as that of his two Natures, whereon it is (though very ruinously) built, is a meer device of Men, for neither is it exprest in Scripture

ture, nor can ſolidly be deduced from thence, as I could quickly ſhew, were it not beſides the buſineſs in hand.

Article IV.

Whence, though he be our God, by reaſon of his Divine Soveraignty over us, and Worſhip due to ſuch Soveraignty, yet is he not the moſt high God, the ſame with the Father, but ſubordinate to Him.

John 20.17. *I* (Jeſus) *aſcend unto my Father, and your Father; and to my God, and your God.* Eph. 1.17. *The God of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, the Father of glory.* Heb. 1.8,9. *But to the Son* (or rather, *of the Son*) *he ſaith, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever, a ſceptre of righteouſneſſe is the ſceptre of thy Kingdome. Thou lovedſt Righteouſneſſe, and hatedſt iniquity, therefore God, (*or rather, *O God,) thy God, hath anointed thee with oyl of Gladneſſe above thy Fellows.* In theſe places which we have cited, Chriſt as he is *the Son of God*, and *Lord*, yea *God*, is ſaid to have a God, and therefore cannot be the moſt High God. Neither will this ſeem ſtrange to him that conſidereth the language of the Scripture, which expreſly maketh mention of the moſt High God, Heb. 7. 1. *Melchiſedech King of Salem, Prieſt of the moſt High God*, and calleth the LORD the

God of Gods, Deut. 10. 17. *The Lord your God is God of Gods, and Lord of Lords.* Both which places shew that there is one, by way of Excellency, or in the most perfit manner called God, but others in a way of subordination, or lesse perfit manner, amongst whom Christ himself, (though otherwise far surpassing the rest,) is notwithstanding ranked, as this place of the Hebrews doth evince beyond all gainsaying, in that it speaketh of Christ as a God, when it saith he hath a God; so that there is no place left for the Adversaries to baffle, telling us that this is spoken of Christ as man, or according to his humane Nature. Now for the further clearing of this matter, I will here exactly unfold the Appellation of *God*, as I find it delineated in the Scripture: for many being ignorant thereof, hold very great and inexplicable errors, touching the Godhead of Christ. First therefore, the Appellation of *God* denoteth him that hath a supernatural living substance, as *Isai.* 31. 3. *The Egyptians are Men, and no God, and their Horses Flesh, and not spirit.* Ezek. 28. 2, 9. *Because thy heart is lifted up, and thou* (Prince of Tyrus) *hast said, I am a God, I sit in the seat of God, in the midst of the seas; yet thou art a Man, and not a God, though thou set thine heart as the heart of God. Wilt thou say before him that slayeth thee, I am a God? But thou shalt be a Man, and no God, in the hand of him that slayeth thee.* Which words plainly intimate that by *God* is here meant a supernatural living substance, that cannot dy, whereas every Natural living substance may be slain. Thus is the LORD called God, and also the Angels, in that they are immortall. Secondly, him that hath a supernaturall Dominion, or such a Domini-

minion as is not managed in a Naturall and Visible way, but in a hidden manner, exceeding the limits of nature. As *Numb.*27.16. *Let the LORD, the God of the Spirits of all flesh, set a man over the Congregation.* Therefore *the God of the Spirits of men*, because he ruleth over them. But such rule or dominion is more then natural, for they that exercise a natural or civil dominion, have power over the flesh onely; hence *Paul* saith, *Eph.* 6.5. *Servants be obedient to your Masters* (or, *Lords*) *according to the flesh*, opposing them to the Lord of their Spirits. In this sense is the Lord also said to be the God of Gods, *Psal.*136.2. [*O give thanks to the God of Gods; for his mercy endureth for ever:*] because he exerciseth dominion over the Angels. Psal.103.20. [*Bless the LORD ye his Angels that excell in strength, that do his commandements, hearkning to the voice of his word:*] but Angels, (as we formerly hinted) are in the Scripture called Gods, as Psal.97.7. *worship him, all ye Gods.* This cannot be meant of Idols, for then the Psalmist, who everywhere detesteth Idols, should here bid them worship God; wherefore it is meant of Angels. see also Psal. 8. 5. *Thou hast made Him* (man) *a little lower then the Angels* (Heb. *then the Gods*, for so the word *Elohim*, here used, signifieth.) Now the dominion which the Lord exerciseth over Angels is not natural or civil, but exceeding the limits of nature, in that the very subjects of this dominion are supernatural. Thirdly, him that hath a sublime dominion conferred on him in a supernatural way; thus *Moses* is called a God, *Exod.*7.1. [*And the Lord said unto Moses, See, I have made thee a God* (*Heb.* Elohim) *to Pharaoh.*] and Nebuchadnezzar, *Ezek.*31.11. [*I have therefore delivered him*

(Pharaoh) *into the hand of the mighty one of the Heathen,* (Heb. *into the hand of the God of the Nations,* Bejad El Gojim) meaning *Nebuchadnezzar,* as appeareth from chap. 30. 24.] for *Moſes* had his dominion beſtowed on him immediately by God, as the text it ſelf ſheweth, ſo alſo had *Nebuchadnezzar*; ſee Jer. 27. 4, 5, 6. *Thus ſaith the Lord of Hoſts, the God of Iſrael, I have made the earth, the man, and the beaſt that are upon the ground, by my power, and by my ouſtretched arm, and have given it to whom it ſeemed meet to me. And now have I given all theſe Lands into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar the King of Babylon my Servant, and the beaſts of the field have I given him alſo to ſerve him.* Fourthly, him that is a beſtower of ſupernatural benefits. Thus is the LORD called *the God of Abraham, the God of Iſaak, and the God of Jacob,* Exod. 3. 6. becauſe he, (as the divine Author to the Hebrews expoundeth it) *hath prepared for them a City,* even the heavenly Jeruſalem, Heb. 11, 16. Fifthly, him that is a ſoveraign Benefactor, beſtowing benefits, (though in themſelves natural) yet in a ſupernatural way, As Gen. 17. 8. *And I will give unto thee, and to thy ſeed after thee, the Land wherein thou art a ſtranger, all the Land of Canaan, for an everlaſting poſſeſſion; and I will be their God.* Therefore their God, becauſe he gave them the Land of *Canaan,* which was done in a ſupernatural way. *For they got not the Land in poſſeſſion by their owne ſword, neither did their owne arm ſave them: but thy right hand, and thy arm, and the light of thy countenance, becauſe thou hadſt a favour to them,* Pſalm 44. 3. ſee alſo Exo. 23. 23. *Mine Angel ſhall go before thee, and bring thee in unto the Amorites, and the Hittites, and the Perizzites, and the Canaanites, and the Hivites, and*

and the Jebusites, and I will cut them off. In all these respects is Christ now rightly stiled a God, having a supernatural, spiritual, and immortal substance; a sublime dominion conferred on him in a supernatural way, even by God raising him up from the dead, and setting him at his owne right hand in the heavenly places; yea a supernatural dominion, even over Angels and the Spirits of men; being also a soveraign benefactor, as bestowing benefits (though in themselves natural, as health, and the like) yet in a supernatural way; yea bestowing supernatural benefits also, as the eternal inheritance, and the pledge thereof, the holy Spirit. Neither was he destitute of supernatural dominion, but was a God even whilst he conversed with men upon the earth; for he had not only authority over diseases and devils to cure where, and when, and whom he pleased, but could give authority to his Disciples to cure diseases and cast out devils, and that in his name. See *Luke* 9. 1. *Then he* (Christ) *called his twelve Disciples together, and gave them power and authority over all Devils, and to cure diseases.* Luke 10. 16. *And the seventy returned againe with joy, saying, Lord, even the Devils are subject unto us through* (Gr. *in*) *thy name.* Yea some that did not follow him, and so were not his Disciples, could notwithstanding cast out Devils in his name. *Luke* 9. 49. *John answered and said, Master, we saw one casting out devils in thy name, and we forbad him, because he followeth not with us.* And this (to give a hint by the way to them who are inquisitive after the truth) putteth a manifest difference between the manner wherein Christ gave power to the Disciples to cure and cast out Devils, and the manner wherein

the holy Spirit; for we read expresly, 1 Cor. 12. 9, 10. *That the holy Spirit gave the gifts of healing, and the operations of miracles,* (or, as the Gr. hath it, *of mighty works.*) Amongst which mighty works, the casting out of Devils is comprehended. For Christ gave them power to cure diseases and cast out Devils, in his name; see *Act.* 3. 6. *Then Peter said* (to the Cripple) *Silver and Gold have I none, but such as I have, I give thee: In the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, rise up and walk:* and Act. 16. 18. *Paul being grieved, turned, and said to the Spirit, I command thee in the name of Jesus Christ to come out of her. And he came out the same hour.* But we never read that any of the Disciples did ever perform cures, or cast out Devils in the name of the holy Spirit. But let us now proceed to other testimonies of the Scripture, from whence it may appear, that though Christ be a God, yet he is not the most high God; see *Isa.* 9. 6, 7. *Unto us a Child is born, and unto us a Son is given, and the Government shall be upon his shoulder; and his name shall be called wonderful, Counseller, a mighty God,* (so it is in the Original, which hath simply *El Gibbor*, not *Hael Haggibbor*, the mighty God, as the Lord of hosts is stiled, *Jer.* 32. 18.) *a Father of the Age,* (or, *of Eternity*) *a Prince of Peace: Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and over his Kingdome, to order it and stablish it with judgment and with justice, from henceforth even for ever; the zeal of the Lord of Hosts will perform this.* In this passage it is remarkable, that the Prophet, after he had called Christ (for undoubtedly this place doth in the full and perfect sense of the words agree to him, though it might in a restrained manner be applyed to *Hezekiah*) after, I say, he had called Christ

a mighty God, and given him other excellent and divine Elogies, he saith in the close of all, *that the Zeal of the Lord of Hosts will perform this*; thereby distinguishing Christ from the Lord of Hosts, and making his Godhead dependent on the bounty of the Lord of Hosts, who would out of his Zeal cause Christ to become a mighty God: so that Christ is not the most High God, but a God subordinate to him; which shall be further made appear from the other texts of the Scripture, wherein Christ hath the Appellation of God given to him. The first is, *Rom.* 9. 5. where the Apostle speaketh in this manner; *Whose are the Fathers, and of whom according to the flesh Christ came, who is over all a God to be blessed for ever. A God*, so the Greek hath it, wherein θεὸς is put without an Article; and were it here used as a proper name, (for so it sometimes is in the Scripture) the words *over all* would be needless (being implyed in it) nor could be construed with the same, for is it congruous to say, *who is Moses, or David over all?* Neither let the Adversaries here object that *Jehovah* is a proper name, and yet it is often said in the Scripture, *Jehovah Sebaoth*, that is, *Jehovah*, or *the Lord of Hosts*: for it is evident from the Scripture, that in this expression there is a defect of the word *God*, as appeareth from 1 Chron. 11. 9. [*so David waxed greater and greater: for the* LORD *of Hosts was with him.*] compared with 2 Sam. 5. 10. *And David went on and grew great, and the* LORD *God of Hosts was with him.* Wherefore the foresaid passage of the Romans doth not shew that Christ is the most High God, but rather the contrary, especially because the place of the Hebrews; which we formerly discussed, plainly giveth us to understand, that Christ is so *a God over all*, as

that

that he himself in the mean time hath a God. For that he is not *a God over all* none excepted, is apparent, for then he would be a God over the Father also, which every one will confess to be most false. But we our selves readily grant that he is *a God over all* save the Father, *who hath set him at his own right hand in the Heavenly places, far above all Principality, and Authority, and Power, and Dominion, and every name named not only in this world, but also in that to come. And hath put all things in subjection under his feet, and given him head over all things to the Church*, and so made him *a God over all*, such dignity not being civil, but Divine; Eph. 1. 20, 21, 22. and who is therefore not only in the 17 verse of the same chap. but elsewhere frequently stiled by the Apostle, *the God of our Lord Jesus Christ*. Furthermore (that we may add this consideration also, which will not a little clear that passage of the Romans, and confirm our Assertion concerning the Godhead of Christ) when the Apostle saith *that Christ came of the Fathers according to the Flesh, who is over all a God to be blessed for ever*, the opposition is not entire and exact, as wanting the other member. What that member is, another passage of the Apostle, wherein you have the same opposition in describing Christ, will inform you, It is Rom. 1. 3, 4. *Concerning his Son Jesus Christ, our Lord, who was made* (or rather, *born*) *of the seed of David according to the Flesh, and declared to be the Son of God with power* (Gr. *determined*, or *ordained Son of God in power*) *according to the Spirit of Holiness, by the resurrection from the Dead.* Here you see that to those words, *according to the Flesh*, are opposed these, *according to the Spirit of Holiness*. Again,

what

what this *Spirit of Holineſs* is, will be no hard matter to find out, if we conſider, that as *the Fleſh* ſignifieth a conſtituting part of Chriſt, namely his Fleſhly Body; ſo alſo muſt *the Spirit of Holineſs*, oppoſed thereunto, ſignify a conſtituting part. If ſo, then it is not the Holy Spirit, as every one will confeſs, Nor the Reaſonable Soule of Chriſt, becauſe he is intimated to have had this *Spirit* by means of the Reſurrection from the dead, whereas he had a Reaſonable Soul before his death. Nor the Divine Nature, for that is nowhere in the Scripture deſigned by the name of *Spirit*, or *Spirit of Holineſs*. Beſides, the Adverſaries hold, that Chriſt had the Divine Nature whilſt he was yet clothed with Fleſh. It remaines therefore that by *Spirit of Holineſs*, which Chriſt had by means of the Reſurrection of the dead, and is a conſtituting part of him; is to be underſtood his *Holy Spiritual Body*; whereby he is excepted from other men, being the firſt-born from the dead, or the firſt that ſo roſe from the dead, as that he never dyed again, but was clothed with a *Spiritual Body*, and made like to God, who is a Spirit. And now the ſence of that paſſage beginneth to appear, Heb. 9. 14. *How much more ſhall the bloud of Chriſt, who through the Eternal Spirit* (Gr. *through an Eternal Spirit*, for no Article is prefixed,) *offered himſelf without ſpot to God, purge your conſciences from dead works to ſerve the living God?* By *Eternal Spirit*, is here meant *the Spiritual Body* of Chriſt, which laſteth to all Eternity; and this expreſſion is oppoſed to what the ſame Divine Author ſpeaketh of Chriſt, Heb. 5. 7. *Who in dayes of his Fleſh*, &c. for *Eternal* is contrary to *dayes*, and *Spirit* to *Fleſh*. Neither will that which we

have

have here ſpoken ſeem ſtrange to him, who having penetrated into that Profound Epiſtle to the Hebrews, knoweth (what is there frequently intimated) that Chriſt then made his offring for our ſins, when, after his Reſurrection, he entred into Heaven, and being endued with a Spiritual and Immortal Body, preſented himſelf before God. For ſo the Type of the Levitical High Prieſt making the yearly Attonement for the ſins of the People (*Levit.* 16.) did require. For as the Attonement was not then made, when he ſlew the Beaſts, but when, having put on his Linen Robes, he brought their bloud into the ſanctuary before the mercy-ſeat: ſo neither did Chriſt offer his ſacrifice for our ſins upon the Croſs, but when after his Reſurrection, being clothed with Robes of Glory and Immortality, he entred into Heaven, the true Sanctuary, and preſented himſelf to God. Wherefore (to return to the foreſaid paſſage, Rom. 9. 5.) when it is here ſaid, *Of whom according to the Fleſh* (for ſo the Greek hath it) *Chriſt came, who is over all a God to be bleſſed for ever*, we ought (by the Authority of the Apoſtle himſelf) to ſupply in our mind the other member of the oppoſition, and to underſtand the place, as if it had been ſaid, *who according to the Spirit of Holineſs by the Reſurrection from the dead, is over all a God bleſſed for ever.* But if Chriſt be *according to the Spirit of Holineſs by the Reſurrection from the dead*, (that is) *according to his Holy Spiritual Body which he received by means of the Reſurrection from the dead, the Son of God in power*, and accordingly *a God over all*, he is not *the Son of God in power*, and accordingly *a God over all*, by having the Divine Nature perſonally united to his Humane Nature, but by the Glorification and Exaltation of his very Humane

Na-

Nature, and so is not the *most High God*, but a *God* subordinate to Him.

The next place is that, John 20. 28, 29. *And Thomas answered and said unto him, My Lord, and my God. Jesus saith unto him, Thomas, because thou hast seen me, thou hast believed.* The words of Christ plainly shew that *Thomas* believed him to be his Lord, and his God, because he had seen him, being raised from the dead. Doth this now argue Christ to be the most *High God?* Yea it strongly proveth the contrary, in that the Scripture elsewhere calleth the most *High God, Invisible*, 1 Tim. 1. 17. and saith, *that none of men* (so the Greek hath it) *hath seen, nor can see him*, 1 Tim. 6. 14, 15, 16. whereas on the contrary it calleth Christ *the Image of the invisible God*, Col. 1. 15. But it is impossible for him that is *the Invisible God*, to be *the Image of the Invisible God*, unless any man will be so absurd as to say, that he is the Image of himself. John 1. 1. *In the beginning* (not of the World, but of the Gospel, see *Mark.* 1. 1. *Luke* 1. 2. and 1 *Joh.* 1. 1. and *Chap.* 2. 7, 13, 14, 24. and 3. 11. and *Epist.* 2. 5. 6. for these words [*in the beginning*] are wont to be restrained to the matter in hand, which here is the Gospel, as appeareth from the very appellation of the *Word*, which is here given to Christ, in regard of his Prophetical Office, in publishing the Gospel) *was the word* (that is, *the Man Christ Jesus* called *the Word*, in that He was the immediate Interpreter of God, by whom he revealed his Counsel touching our Salvation, as we are wont to disclose our secrets by our words; which reason may not obscurely be collected from the 18 *Vers.* of the same *Chapter*,) *and the word was with God*, (being taken up into Heaven, that so that he might talk

with

with God, and be indeed his *Word*, or the immediate Interpreter of his Will, and receive the most certain and absolute knowledg of the Kingdom of Heaven, which he was to propose to men: see Joh. 6.38,46,51,62. where Christ affirmeth, *That he came down from Heaven, and had seen God: and that as he was the living bread, which came down from Heaven, whereof whosoever did eat, should live for ever; so the bread which he would give, was his flesh, which he would give for the life of the world:* And afterwards asketh the Jews, *What if they should see the Son of Man ascending up where he was before?* namely, before he began to preach the Gospel, as he himself intimateth, *Joh.* 8. 42. where he saith, *If God were your Father, ye would love me, for I went out from God, and came; for neither came I of my self, but He sent me.* And John 16. 28. where he saith, *I came out from the Father, and came into the world: Again* (or rather, *on the contrary*) *I leave the world, and go to the Father.* Which *going forth from the Father*, every one may easily perceive, by the opposition of the following clause, is meant of a Locall Procession of Christ from God; and that before the discharge of his Embassy for *to come*, or *to come into the world*, signifieth to treat with men in the name of God, and to perform a publick office among them; See *Joh.* 1.15,27.30. and 1 *Joh.*5.20. *Mat.*11.3,18,19. *Joh.* 17.18. compared with Chap.16.21. and Chap.18. 37. *And the word was a God*, (as being endued with divine Power and Empire,) for according to the reasoning of Christ himself, *Joh.* 10. 35. If the Psalmist call them Gods, to whom *the vocall word of God* came, and the Scripture cannot be broken, (as it would, if any one should deny them

to

be Gods:) is not he much more a God, who is endued with ſo divine a dominion, that he is *the very ſubſtantial word of God?* This paſſage alſo ſheweth, that Chriſt is not the moſt high God, the ſame with the Father. For when he is ſaid *to have been with God*, the word [*God*] there, by the confeſſion of all, ſignifieth the moſt high God, (ſince the very article ſet before it in the Greek, importeth ſo much) and therefore when He himſelf is afterwards ſaid to be *a God*, (with the omiſſion of the foreſaid article in the Greek) neither will the words, nor thing it ſelf, ſuffer Chriſt to be the ſame God with Him, with whom he was; (that is, *the moſt High God*) for then he would have been ſaid to be with himſelf, which is ridiculous. So that theſe words, which are uſually brought to prove the ſupreme Divinity of Chriſt, being well examined, do quite overthrow it. Thus have we retorted all the places of the Scripture, wherein the appellation of God is given to Chriſt, againſt the Adverſaries, ſhewing from them that Chriſt is not the moſt High God. But were all that we have ſaid, laid aſide, this very thing (if men had not renounced their Reaſon, and made Nonſenſe the Mother of their Devotion) is ſufficient to decide the Controverſie, namely, that Chriſt is called in the Scripture *the Son of the moſt High God*. For if he be both *the Son of the moſt High God*, and *the moſt High God* too, he will be the Son of himſelf, which is abſurd.

Article

Article V.

Again, though he be a God, ſubordinate to the moſt High God, as having received his Godhead, and whatſoever he hath, from the Father; yet may not any one thence rightly inferre, that by this account there will be another God, or two Gods. For though we may, with allowance of the Scripture, ſay, that there are many Gods, yet neither will the Scripture, nor the thing it ſelf permit us to ſay, that there is another God, or two Gods: becauſe when a word in its own nature common to many, hath been appropriated, and aſcribed to one by way of Excellency, (as that of God hath been to the Father,) albeit this doth not hinder us from ſaying, that there are many of that name, yet doth it from ſaying, that there is another, or two, ſince that would be all one as if we ſhould ſay, that there is another, or two moſt Excellent, (which is abſurd,)

absurd,) for when two are segregated in this manner out of many, they claime Excellency to themselves alike. Thus though some faithfull man be a Son of God, subordinate to the chief Son of God Christ Iesus, yet may we not thereupon say, that there is another Son of God, or two Sons of God, (since that would have make another, or two Sons of God by way of Excellency, whereas there can be but one such a Son) howbeit otherwise the Scripture warrant us to say, that there are many Sons of God.

1 Cor. 8. 4, 5, 6. *We know that there is no Idol* (so the Greek hath it) *in the world, and that there is no other God but one. For though there be called Gods,* (so the Greek hath it) *whether in the Heaven, or on the Earth, (as there are many Gods, and many Lords:) Yet to us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all the things,* (so the Greek hath it) *and we for him; and one Lord, Jesus Christ, by whom are all the things, and we by him.* Heb. 2. 10. *It became Him, for whom are all the things,* (so the Greek hath it) *and by whom are all the things,* (that is, God) *in bringing many Sons to Glory, to make the Captaine of their salvation perfit through sufferings.*

Article VI.

I believe that there is one principal Minister of God and Christ, peculiarly sent from Heaven to sanctifie the Church, who, by reason of his eminency and intimacy with God, is singled out of the number of the other heavenly Ministers or Angels, and comprised in the Holy TRINITY, *being the third person thereof; and that this Minister of God and Christ is the holy Spirit.*

John 14.26. *But the Comforter,* (or rather, *Advocate,* as the word in the Greek importeth, and Beza accordingly rendreth it, *Advocatus*) *which is the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name, He shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you.* Where note by the way, that the holy Spirit is called the *Advocate* (which very appellation sufficiently intimates, that he is not that supream and independent Monarch *Jehovah*,) chiefly for two Reasons. 1. Because he instructeth the Saints, especially when they are brought before persecuting Rulers, how to plead their owne, and their Master Christs cause: See *Mat.* 10.17, 18, &c. *John* 16.7. *&c.* In opposition whereunto, the unclean Spirit Satan is called the *Adversarie,* 1 *Pet.* 5.8. namely, in that he suggesteth

gesteth slanders, and false accusations to the men of this world, against Christ and his people; see *John* 8.38,44. Secondly, Because when the Saints sink under some great pressure and affliction, and are at a loss, not knowing which way to turn themselves, nor what to pray for as they ought, then comes in the holy Spirit to their assistance, and intercedeth with most earnest and unexpressible groans to God in their behalf, *Rom.* 8.26, 27. In opposition whereunto, the unclean Spirit, Satan, is called *the Accuser of the Brethren*, in that *he accuseth them night and day before the throne of God*, Rev. 12.10. Job 1.9. and *that.* 2.4,5. Note also, that the holy Spirit is said *to be sent*, and that *in the name of another*, yea *of a man*, (since not onely the thing it self, but also the whole tenour of Christs discourse intimateth, that he speaks of himself as a man,) but it is absurd to say, *that the most High God can be sent*, (since that is proper to Inferiours and Ministers;) more absurd yet to say, *that he can be sent in the name of another*; but most absurd of all to say, *that he can be sent in the name of a man.* Joh. 15.26. *But when the Advocate is come, whom I will send you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, that proceedeth* (or, *goeth out*) *from the Father, He shall testifie of me.* This description of the holy Spirit, namely, *that he proceedeth from the Father*, serveth to shew both the Reason of our Saviours former words, wherein he had said that *He would send the holy Spirit from the Father*, and also that the holy Spirit is of most intimate acquaintance with the Father; and as *Piscary* so speak, *Lapide a latere.* And indeed, were not men blinded with Romish Tradition, they would never draw such a monstrous conclusion from these words, as they

are wont to do, namely, because the holy Spirit is here said *to proceed from the Father*, that therefore he receiveth the the Divine Essence, and consequently is God, by eternal procession from the Father, (for as for his procession from the Son, though that be rife in mens mouths, yet doth not the Scripture make mention of it anywhere:) Which Essential and Eternal Procession is not onely in it self absurd, but hath also no good footing in this text, (nor pretendeth to have footing in any other,) and is therefore to be rejected, as a bold and senseless figment of mans brain. For observe that it is not here said of the holy Spirit, ἐκπορεύεται ἐκ τοῦ Πατρός, *he proceedeth out of the Father*, (though even then that Essential Procession could not have solidly been inferred thence, for ἐκπορεύεσθαι, or (which is all one) ἐξελθεῖν ἐκ τινος, being spoken of a Person, is wont to be understood of a Local Procession; See *John* 8. 42. *Act.* 15. 24. 1 *John* 2. 19.) but ἐκπορεύεται παρὰ τοῦ Πατρός, i. *he proceedeth from the Father*. Now ἐκπορεύεσθαι παρά τινος, i. *to proceed from one*, being spoken of a person, every puny in Greek can tell signifieth his going from ones house, or presence, and so intimates onely a Local Procession; which made *Beza*, in his Annotations on this place, ingenuously confess, that this Description concerneth not the Essence of the holy Spirit. Wherefore this place is so far from proving, that it quite subverteth the supposed Deity of the holy Spirit, since, if he were God, he could not locally proceed from any one, inasmuch as he would then not onely be in anothers Mansion, but also change place; whereas God, by the confession of all, as he cannot be in any Mansi-

on that is not his own, so neither doth he shift places: *John* 16. 7, 8, &c. *Nevertheless, I tell you the truth; it is expedient for you that I go away: for if I go not away, the Advocate will not come unto you: but if I depart, I will send him to you. And when he is come, he shall convince the world of sin, of righteousness, and of Judgement. I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit, when He, the Spirit of truth, is come, he shall lead you into all the truth* (namely, of those things which Christ had yet to say to them;) *for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak,* (which words clearly intimate, that the holy Spirit could not lead the Disciples into all the truth of those things that Christ had yet to say to them, unless they were first disclosed to the Spirit himself by Christ) *and he shall shew you things to come. He shall glorifie me, for he shall receive of mine, and shew it to you.* This thing doth indeed set forth the transcendent glory of Christ, namely, that whereas he himself, while he led a mortal life here on the earth, was wont in many things to be taught by the Spirit; See *Isa.* 11. 1, 2. yet after his Exaltation, he should not onely send the holy Spirit, but also give him Instructions concerning what he was to make known unto the Disciples. The fulfilling whereof may be seen in the three first Chapters of the *Revelation*. For he that there speaketh to *John*, is not Jesus Christ himself, both because in the entrance of Chap. 1. it is said that Jesus Christ signified the Revelation to his servant *John*, not by himself, but *sending by his Angel*; and also because in the 13 verse of the same Chap. *John* saith that *he saw one like to the Son of Man*; but if so, then he was

not the Son of man himself. Who that Angel therefore is that there speaketh to *John*, in the person and name of Christ, may easily be gathered from the *Epiphonema*, or Acclamation, put at the close of every Epistle directed to the seven *Asian* Churches, where the Angel having before spoken in the person of Christ, now speaketh in his owne person, saying, *He that hath an ear to hear, let him hear, what the Spirit saith unto the Churches*; thereby sufficiently giving us to understand that he was the holy Spirit, who being appointed by Christ to guide and instruct his people, ought to be hearkned to. *Eph.4.4,5,6. There is one Body, and one Spirit, even as ye have been called in one Hope of your calling; One Lord, one Faith, one Baptisme; One God and Father of all, who is over all, and among all, and in you all*, 1 Cor.12. 4,5,6. *There are diversities of Gifts, but the same Spirit. And there are diversities of Administrations, but the same Lord. And there are diversities of Operations, but it is the same God that worketh all in all*, (namely, as the primary Author; whereas the Lord Jesus worketh them as the secondary efficient; and the holy Spirit as the instrument, to whom, as being a most wise and faithful Steward and Deputy (they are the Expressions of * *Tertullian*, who truely and appositely called the holy Spirit, *Patris villicum, Christi vicarium*) God and Christ gave leave, for the confirmation of the Gospel, to distribute the spiritual Gifts here specified, according to his owne will, as you may see both in the 11 verse of this very chapter, and *Heb.*2.3.) These two passages, though we could produce no others out of the Scripture, are

* *Præscr. Adv. Haret. chap.*28.

are abundantly ſufficient to refute the vulgar opinion touching the Deity of the holy Spirit, ſince the Apoſtle doth expreſly and purpoſely diſtinguiſh him from *that one God*, and *that one Lord of Chriſtians*. But if he be neither *that one God*, nor *that one Lord of Chriſtians*, certainly he can be no other then a Miniſtring Spirit. Wherefore it is palpably evident from hence, that the TRINITY, which the Apoſtle *Paul* believed, conſiſteth of *one God, one Lord, & one Spirit*, but not of three perſons in one God; otherwiſe God himſelf will be one of the three perſons in God, which is abſurd. So that thoſe Chriſtians that pretend (and indeed they do but pretend) to admit nothing but the Scripture for the rule of their Faith, may be aſhamed to ſwerve from the Apoſtles doctrine in a thing ſo plainly and poſitively delivered by him, and which ſo neerly concerneth both the glory of God, and the ſalvation of men; ſince this very opinion of three Perſons in God, is not onely the ſource of almoſt all the Errors commonly held amongſt Chriſtians, which are many and groſs, but alſo the main ſtumbling-block that keepeth many thouſands from entring into the Church of Chriſt, in that they apprehend this to be the Error of the Chriſtian Religion it ſelf, whereas it is onely the Error of thoſe that profeſs it. 1 *Cor.* 2. 10, 11. *But God hath revealed them to us by his Spirit*, (mark how the Spirit is not onely diſtinguiſhed from God, but alſo made the inſtrument whereby he reveaſeth the Myſteries of the Goſpel,) *for the Spirit ſearcheth all things* (that is, all things pertaining to the ſalvation of men, for the word [*all*] is wont to be reſtrained to the matter in hand; thus in verſe 15. of this very chap.

the ſpiritual man is ſaid to judge or diſcerne all things) even the depths of God: (Thus ſome men are ſaid to be acquainted with the *depths of Satan*, Rev. 2. 24.) *For who of men knoweth the things of a man, ſave the Spirit of man that is in him? Even ſo the things of God knoweth none but the Spirit of God*: (He doth not add as before, *that is in him.*) When the Apoſtle here ſaith, *That none knoweth the things of God but the Spirit of God*, The excluſive particle [*none*] is put to exclude ſome perſons; thoſe perſons muſt of neceſſity be either Humane, Angelical, or Divine, ſince no other perſons are to be found. Not humane Perſons, for then the holy Spirit will be in the number of men, (which is abſurd,) ſince that onely is wont to be excepted, which is otherwiſe comprehended under the general name, and which, if it had not expreſly been excepted, would have been thought to be included. Not Divine Perſons, for then the ſecond Perſon, which is commonly held, will be excluded: For if no Divine Perſon *know the things of God*, (that is, of the Father, for he, by the confeſſion of all, is here ſignified by the name of God) but the Spirit, then the ſecond Perſon would not know them, which overturneth the ſuppoſition of the Adverſaries, touching the three Perſons of God. It remaineth therefore that the excluſive particle [*none*] is here made uſe of to exclude Angelical Perſons, and conſequently, that the holy Spirit is in the number of Angels, otherwiſe he needed not to have been by name excepted. Whence we may collect, That of all the heavenly Miniſters the holy Spirit was firſt made acquainted with the ſecrets of God, touching the Goſpel, and accordingly he above others

others was employed in revealing them to the Apostles, according to the reasoning of *Paul* himself in this place: which thing argueth his intimacy with God, and eminency above all the rest of the heavenly Host; and likewise affordeth us the reason, why he in the Scripture is sometimes exempted out of the appellation of Angels; it being usual for one to be exempted out of the appellation of those of his kinde, by reason of some excellency. Thus *Peter* is segregated from the Apostles, because he had the preheminence among them, 1 *Cor.* 9.5. And *Saul* is distinguished from the Enemies of *David*, not because he was none of them, but in that he was the chief of them, *Psal.* 18. 1. And upon the same account Christ Jesus is sometimes in the Scripture distinguished from men, see *Gal.* 1. 1, 12. *Heb.* 7. 28. And these things, (Christian Reader) have I urged, supposing the holy Spirit to be a Person, as most of the Adversaries hold. Yet forasmuch as some (who otherwise assent to the truth concerning the holy Spirit) mistake in denying his Personality, I think good here to confirm it. Consider therefore the places which I have cited out of the 14, 15, and 16 of *John*, and when thou hast seriously, laying aside all prejudice, so done, it will be impossible for thee (especially being thus admonished) to embrace either the opinion of *Athanasius*, who held the holy Spirit to be a Person of supream Deity, or that of *Socinus*, who believed him to be the divine power or efficacy, but no Person. The Error of *Athanasius* I have already briefly in this Article confuted, but more largely in the foregoing twelve Arguments. As for that of *Socinus*, tell me, whosoever thou art that adherest there-

thereunto, whether Christ would have called the holy Spirit, *the Advocate*, if he had not been a Person? can any thing but a Person discharge such an Office, have such a title? Thou wilt say, *David* calleth the Testimonies of God, *his Counsellors*, *Psa.* 119. 24. Right. But doth he so call them *Counsellors*, as Christ calleth the holy Spirit *Advocate*? doth he put the word *Counsellors* simply and by it self, or (as the learned phrase it) *subjectively*, for the Testimonies of God? doth he say, *I will speak of the Counsellors*, or *turn my feet to the Counsellors*, or *I have kept the Counsellors*, thereby intending the Testimonies of God? But Christ saith, *If I go not away, the Advocate will not come*, and *I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Advocate*, and *when the Advocate is come, whom I will send you from the Father*, thereby meaning (as he explains himself) the holy Spirit. Thou wilt reply, that *wisdome*, *Prov.* 8. is brought in as a Person, which notwithstanding is no Person. But how can it be made appear that by *wisdome* in this place is not meant a Person, by a *metonymie* or *transnomination* called *wisdome*? Certainly the circumstances of the place intimate the contrary: for thus Wisdome speaketh, *I love them that love me, and those that seek me early shall finde me. The Lord possessed me in the beginning of his way, before his works of old. I was set up* (or, *anointed*, as the Hebrew word signifieth) *from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the earth was. When there were no depths, I was brought forth* (or, *formed*,) *when there were no fountains abounding with water. When he prepared the heavens, I was there, when he appointed the foundations of the earth: Then was I by him, as one brought up with him* (Heb.

a Foster-child, or (as the Septuagint intimate) *an Artist*) *and I was daily his delight, rejoycing always before him: Rejoycing in the habitable part of his earth, and my delights were with the sons of men.* Is it possible for the wit of man, with any probability to devise how these things should be applyed to that which is no Person? Who this Person is, I have formerly shewn, even the Person under consideration, the holy Spirit, who moved on the waters, when God was about to create the world; whose delights are with the sons of men; and he accordingly called *the Spirit of grace*, for the favour that he beareth towards them; who may aptly be called *wisdome*, and say, *Counsel is mine, I have strength*; being *the Spirit of wisdom, counsel, and might, or strength*, as Isaiah, chap. 11. testifieth. Againe, how could Christ say, *that the Spirit should not speak of himself, but what he should hear*, if he were not a Person? how, *that he should receive of his, and declare it to the Disciples?* Certainly they that adhere to the doctrine of *Sotinus* touching Christ (wherein without question that man saw the truth) must either renounce it, and return to *Athanasius*, or embrace this which I hold touching the Person of the holy Spirit. For is it imaginable that the holy Spirit, being the power and efficacy of God, immediately flowing out of his Essence, should hear from Christ, and receive of his, when in the mean time neither is himself a Person, nor hath Christ the same divine Essence? Furthermore, how could the holy Spirit *search all things, even the depths of God?* 1 Cor. 2. How *make intercession for the Saints with groanes unutterable?* Rom. 8. How could he say to the

Chri-

Christians at *Antioch, Separate me Barnabas and Saul, for the work whereunto I have called them?* Act. 13. 2. How to *Peter, Behold, three men seek thee; Arise therefore, and get thee down, and go with them, doubting nothing; for I have sent them?* How could it be said of him, *that he distributeth Spiritual Gifts as he will?* 1 Cor. 12. 11. How could we be exhorted by the Apostle, *not to grieve the holy Spirit?* Eph. 4. 30. How finally could Christ command his Apostles *to baptize all the discipled Nations into the name as of the Father, and the Son, so also of the holy Spirit?* If these things, and sundry more which may be alledged out of the Scripture, do not evince the holy Spirit to be a Person, what can? But the Adversaries, with whom we have now to deal, will object, that several things are in like manner ascribed to the holy Spirit, which agree not to a Person. Thus is he said to be *an earnest* (or rather, as the Greek word ἀῤῥαβὼν signifieth, a *Pledge*. See *Gen.* 38. 17, 18. Ἡ δὲ εἶπεν. ἐὰν δῷς μοι ἀῤῥαβῶνα, ἕως τοῦ ἀποστεῖλαί σε. Ὁ δὲ εἶπε, τίνα τὸν ἀῤῥαβῶνα δώσω σοι; that is, according to the English Translation, *Wilt thou give me a Pledge till thou send it? And he said, what Pledge shall I give thee?* See also verse 20. κομίσασθαι παρὰ τῆς γυναικὸς τὸν ἀῤῥαβῶνα, *to receive the Pledge from the womans hand: and to be shed upon the faithful*; and they said *to be anointed, baptized,* and *sealed with the holy Spirit*; and God *to give of his Spirit.* But it is easie to shew that such things as these are in the Scripture, and other approved Writers, attributed to Persons; but such Personal things as we have before rehearsed concerning the holy Spirit, are never in the Scripture, or other approved Authors, (unless

less Poets, to whom liberty of Fiction is granted, and who consequently may make Persons of what they please) attributed to them that are not Persons. For instance, *Terence* in *Heaut. Act.* 3. *Sc.* 3. calleth a Damsel *a Pledge*, saying,

Ea mortua est. Reliquit filiam adolescentulam:
Ea relicta huic arrhaboni est pro illo argento.

which place further sheweth the true signification of *Arrhabo* to be that which we formerly assigned. Likewise *Paul* saith, *Put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ*, Rom. 13. 14. And, *My little Children, of whom I travel in birth again untill Christ be formed in you.* Gal. 4. 19. And, *As ye have received Christ Jesus the Lord, walk ye in him*, Col. 2. 6. And, *Ye are our Epistle written in our hearts, known and read of all men*, 2 Cor. 3. 2. And, *The Seal of my Apostleship are ye in the Lord.* 1 Cor. 9. 2. And Christ himself, *None can come unto me, except it were given* (or rather, *except there be given*) *to him of my Father.* (the Gr. hath it, ἐὰν μὴ ἦ δεδομένον, the same expression that is used, when it is said, *that God hath given us of his Spirit*, 1 John 4. 13. ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος αὐτοῦ.) You see by what hath been alledged, that either the very same Impersonal Expressions, which are attributed to the Holy Spirit, are also attributed to other Persons, or other expressions altogether as far distant from Personality. Wherefore it will be far more suitable, by a *Metonymie*, or *Metaphor*, (usual enough in such cases) to salve these few Impersonal Expressions, attributed to the Holy Spirit, being a Person, as the tenor of the Scripture exhibiteth him to us; then by a Prosopopœia, (which must of necessity prove very uncouth

uncouth and monstrous, to elude those many Personall Expressions, attributed to the Holy Spirit, being no Person, as only some few places seem to hold him forth to us. Having sufficiently asserted the Personality of the Holy Spirit, let us now in the close of all speak briefly of what is peculiar to him. I omit what *Siracides* saith of the Holy Spirit under the name of wisedome, he being the Spirit of wisedome, namely *that became out of the mouth of the most High*, Chap. 24. 3. and consequently had his production in that manner, being, (as another wise man also speaketh of him under the name aforesaid) *a vapor of the power of God, and a sincere emanation* (or, *efflux*) *of the Glory of the Almighty*; *Wisd. Salom.* chap. 7. 25. to which accordeth that of *Elihu*, Job 33. 4. *The Spirit of God hath made me, and the breath of the Almighty hath given me life.* Where (after the manner of the Hebrews) the same thing is repeated in different words, *the Breath of the Almighty* being put for what had in the former part of the sentence been called, *the Spirit of God.* And methinks the very appellation *of the Spirit of God*, doth of it self sufficiently intimate, that what those two forequoted writers speak of wisedom, is applicable to the Holy Spirit. But these things (as I said before) I now omit, enquiring only what are the peculiar Priviledges, and Operations of the Holy Spirit. His peculiar Priviledg therefore is, that he only of all the ministring Spirits, being of a more pure and penetrating nature, and of more intimate admission, is first acquainted with the depths, or profound secrets of God, as hath been before argued in this very Article, out of 1 *Cor.* 2. 10, 11. where when the Apostle saith, *who of men knoweth the things of a man,*

save

save the Spirit of a man that is in him? Even so the things of God knoweth none, save the Spirit of God: the other member, necessary to make the opposition compleat, is to be supplied in our mind; and the place understood, as if the Apostle had said, *Even so the things of God knoweth none of the Ministring Spirits or Angels, save the Spirit of God*; as I before have evinced. Neither let any man take offence, whilst I intimate the Holy Spirit to be an Angel, for though he were not expresly so called in the Scripture, (as I verily believe he is, though the places are not such as to be altogether free from cavil,) yet is the thing it self beyond all controversie ascribed to him. For demonstration, the word *Angel* Originally Greek, and the Hebrew Malak answering thereunto, signifieth any Messenger whatsoever, but is in Scripture oftentimes appropriated to signifie a Spirit or Heavenly Messenger. In both which respects the Holy Spirit is an Angel, being not only a Messenger, but a Spiritual Messenger sent out of Heaven, as Peter testifieth, 1 Pet. 1, 12. As for the Peculiar Operations of the Holy Spirit, the first is sanctification, performed by imparting Spiritual Gifts unto them, whereby they are consecrated and set apart to the service of God, see 1 Cor. 6. 11. *but ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified in the name of our Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God.* By *Sanctification* cannot here be meant, the cleansing of the Corinthians from the filth of their sins, for that is expressed by *washing*; but the consecrating of them to God, by conferring on them Spiritual Gifts, see also 1 Cor. 12. 4, 11. *There are diversities of Gifts, but the same Spirit. Now all these worketh one and the same Spirit, distributing to*

every

every one, as he will. For though other good Spirits are also employed about the Faithful, for they are all ministring Spirits, sent out to minister for their sakes, that shall inherit salvation, as the Divine Author to the Hebrews testifieth, chap. 1. 14. and do not only guard, by pitching their Tents round about them, Psal. 34. 8. but also inspire them as they prophesie and speak with strange tongues, (which sheweth how the Holy Spirit may inspire divers at the same time) 1 Cor. 14. 12, 13, 14, 15. Even so ye, forasmuch as ye are zealous of Spirits, (so the Greek hath it, as the Translators themselves in the Margin confess, who not understanding the thing itself, add in the text for Spirits put Spiritual Gifts) seek that you may excel (Gr. abound) to the edifying of the Church. Wherefore let him that speaketh in an unknown tongue, pray that he may interpret. For if I pray in an unknown tongue, my Spirit prayeth, but my understanding (Or, mind) is unfruitful. What is it then? I will pray with the Spirit, and will pray with the understanding also. I will sing with the Spirit, and will sing with the understanding also. See also verse 32. And the Spirits of the Prophets are subject to the Prophets. Behold here in the words which I have cited, there is twice mention made of Spirits in the Plural number, whilst the Apostle discourseth of them that spake with strange tongues, and Prophesied. Neither can the Understandings or Minds of the Linguists and Prophets be understood by those Spirits, since the Apostle, verse 14. putteth a manifest difference between the Spirit, and the Understanding or Mind of him that spake in an unknown tongue. Neither are Spiritual Gifts meant; for they are in Greek called πνευματικα, Spirituals, 1 Cor. 12. 1. nor πνευματα, Spirits. It remain-

remaineth therefore that *Ministring Spirits* are meant, who inspired the several Linguists and Prophets, and are therefore said to be subject to the Prophets, because they could either make use of and utter their Inspirations, or suspend the use of the same, by permitting others to speak, inasmuch as those *Spirits* did not hurry the Prophets so violently, as *evil Spirits* are reported to drive false Prophets amongst the Heathen, otherwise God by giving them to the Prophets in the Church, would be the Author of tumult and confusion, but not of order; whilst every one that was inspired at the same time with another, was necessitated to utter his inspiration as well as he. Though other *good Spirits*, (I say,) are employed about the Faithful, in the exercise of Prophesie and strange tongues, yet the assignation and conferring of those Gifts peculiarly belongeth to the Holy Spirit, as the Apostle clearly testifieth. The second peculiar Operation of the Holy Spirit, is *to give Believers access through Christ to the Father*, Eph. 2. 18. For he being *the Spirit of Adoption, doth witness to their Spirits that they are the Children of God*, and so maketh them *to cry Abba Father*, Rom. 8. 15. 16. and consequently is *the Pledge of their Inheritance*, Eph. 1. 13, 14. (for so I before shewed that the word ἀῤῥαβὼν in the Gr. ought to be rendred, and not *Earnest*, as the English Translators have it,) some other things perhaps there be, as the ordering of matters in the Church, and setting of Officers therein, and also laying of burthens upon Christians, (see *Act.* 15. 28.) which seem to be peculiar to the Holy Spirit above others, yet since the Scripture doth not say, *that none save the Spirit doth these things*, or *that*